

## COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

**May 11, 2004**

**6:30 PM**

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Lopez

Messrs.: M. Boldin, F. Nugent, K. Burkush, F. Bass, R. MacKenzie,  
R. Johnson, K. Sheppard, K. Clougherty, Deputy O'Leary,  
Deputy Simmons

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Presentation by representatives of the Office of Youth Services, School District, Police Department and a State agency relative to a potential grant opportunity for the Wrap for Youth Resiliency (WYR) project.

Mr. Martin Boldin stated basically the Office of Youth Services has been approached by the Mayor's Office and members from the OJJDP to present an application for basically the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Formula Grant. What we have done to put this proposal together is we have had several meetings with key stakeholders in the City including MPD, the School District, JPPO's from the Juvenile Justice Division of DHHS. In the packet that I have handed out to you there is a list of over 40 people who have been involved in some level of organization building to develop the concept that we put in front of you. I would ask you to turn to Page 3 of the handout that I have given you. The center column that you see there represents the basic process that juveniles go through from first identifying a problem in the juvenile justice system or in the community. They are usually identified thereafter by either our office, the Manchester School District or the Manchester Police Department. After that, petitions are made to the court – a child in need of supervision petition. If that process goes through the child is assigned a JPPO. At that point if a child is not able to develop appropriate behaviors in the community, at home or in the school there is the risk of them going to the Youth Development Center. It is our proposal here to basically develop what we are calling the WYR Program (Wrap Around for Youth Resiliency) and basically our idea here is to do three very distinctly different

things with two staff. Number one is to work with the Manchester School District through the Office of the Director of Student Services to identify five children from each of the middle schools here in Manchester who have histories of delinquency like behavior, truancy, in school suspensions and assign our worker to pull together a team around them. In other words to coordinate services that are provided by the School District, by Manchester Police, our offices and other appropriate agencies that would be meeting the needs of those children in the community to make sure that a comprehensive plan is developed that would meet their needs to help them reduce delinquency behaviors, reduce truancy, improve school grades and reduce their problematic behavior at home. We are calling that the Pre-Wrap Program because these are young people who have not yet been formally introduced to the criminal justice system through any court intervention. The second thing that we would want to do is actually coordinate the Manchester Police Department, School District, Office of Youth Services and JPPO's to review cases that each of our officers would be presenting to the District Court for CHINS petitions. This way, by coordinating those services and discussing the service array that is available for young people out there and making sure that we have dotted every I and crossed every T it is our belief that we would be able to at least limit or reverse the trend of increasing CHINS petitions that are going to the City. Finally, our goal is to work with the Youth Development Center on the behalf of young people who would be returning to Manchester anyway to see if we could develop a coordinated plan with them in conjunction with JPPO's here in the City of Manchester to assure a smooth transition for those young people who will be coming back to Manchester basically looking at behaviors at home, in the school and in the community to make sure that we have an appropriate service array in place to reduce the likelihood of delinquency and truancy like behaviors, so on and so forth. That ladies and gentlemen is in a nutshell the basis of the proposal in front of you.

Alderman Shea stated I have about seven questions. Some are brief and some aren't. The first one is, is there a provision for the failure of parents to be cooperative in your particular project? Let's assume that all of the parties are working together but you meet up with uncooperative parents or guardians or so forth.

Mr. Boldin responded absolutely. I think that all of the agencies involved – the School District, the Police Department, Office of Youth Services and JPPO's all have procedures in place to deal with parents that are unwilling to meet basic requirements made of them to provide appropriate treatment and services for their young people. Essentially at our office what we need to do is evaluate whether or not that parent's behavior falls under the guidelines of the Division of Children, Youth and Families and whether or not that parent is delinquent in the parenting

by either neglect or the children are dependent upon the state for further care outside the parental realm.

Alderman Shea asked so you would have the prerogative to introduce or to initiate a certain amount of criminal action against the parents if they are not cooperative or is the child dropped from the program.

Mr. Boldin answered that actually exists among all of the youth serving agencies right now. If a parent is not meeting the basic needs of their children we are all mandated reporters, which means the state says that we have to report those families to DHHS, the Division of Children, Youth and Family.

Alderman Shea stated when you mentioned in your project...what is meant by appropriate resources being tapped. Does that mean that you are going to work with other agencies or does that mean that they will work with you?

Mr. Boldin responded essentially Alderman one of the things that we struggle with now is that the service delivery system for young people is stressed like no time that I have seen since I have been in Manchester. Funds are really dry right now. There are agencies that are going under. So, the service delivery mechanism between agencies is reducing at a time when youth needs in the City are increasing. Like I stated in the proposal we have a tremendous amount of data that suggests that culture, language barriers, refugees and immigrants moving into the City, along with looking at different youth behaviors like delinquency and status offenses are all being stressed right now. One of the main points of this grant is to use personnel to really help get everybody on the same page. Right now in the school system that we deal with we have guidance counselors, school psychologists, school social workers and we have the school resource officers, the juvenile division, our office provides services, at times JPPO's are involved in the schools and what is happening is a lot of times these families are not able to access the services the way that they would want to so what they start doing is calling all of these different agencies at once so in a lot of cases one family can be involved with many different agencies and not everybody is on the same page. We know through research that if we get people on the same page and if we try to include families in the process of helping their children that the outcomes will be great and ultimately we will save young people from entering into the criminal justice system. I am sure that many of my colleagues in the youth serving agencies can attest to the fact that many of the parents we deal with are under equipped and overwhelmed by the needs that their children are presenting them with so it is our hope that by providing a single point to basically take these cases that are extremely at risk of entering the criminal justice system and identifying them to everybody that we could have a situation where ultimately we could have community policing officers, our office staff and the entire intervention staff

including the SAP's at the schools all aware of these young people that need guidance and help so that if something comes up and piece of information comes up in an English class or if a piece of information about a young person comes up on a patrol in the community or a phone call is made to our office or any of the participating agencies that there be an immediate report back to this Youth Services Counselor who would make sure that everybody is on the same page.

Alderman Shea asked will the students remain at their regular schools or will other placements be recommended.

Mr. Boldin answered the plan that we have put in place is a community based plan. We are not...it is our hope to maintain placement in the community and to maintain the resource and to use the existing array of resources in a much more effective way but everybody needs to know that from time to time cases come up where the existing service array is not going to meet those needs and as a result we might be involved in looking at alternative placement. Again, that is not the focus of this program. The philosophy of this program is to maintain people in the community in a way that reduces risk to the community and increases their likelihood to succeed in their community as much as possible.

Alderman Shea asked you do plan to involve the resource police personnel at the middle schools correct.

Mr. Boldin answered we have had extensive conversations with the Manchester Police Department, Manchester School District, the JPPO's and staff at YDC. All of those people intended to be represented tonight except for YDC who cannot be here because they are one of the evaluating people on the application and it would be a conflict of interest for them to be here.

Alderman Shea stated one of my other questions is there are several non-profit agencies that work with children such as Child and Family Services and in the CIP budget we do allocate close to \$15,000 to them and to Americorp we allocate about \$10,000. These are two out of several. How would your program interact with such existing non-profit agencies, if at all?

Mr. Boldin responded on the last page of your handout and it is not numbered and that is my fault and I apologize but it is entitled Wrap for Youth Resiliency List of Supporters. There are 40 agencies there that are committed...as a matter of fact the only people who we have asked for letters of support from who have declined are other people who are actually applying for this grant. I think that because we have the support of the Police Department and the Schools and because the Office of Youth Services works very diligently to support and work with all of the existing social service agencies in the City, I think that we have a good knowledge

of what services are out there that are provided by those places and how to access those services in a more effective way in some cases than people who are self-referred. One of the jobs of these individuals will be to follow-up to make sure that not only are the referrals made but the connection point has been made and to actually make sure that the services are being received and are necessary and appropriate to the needs of the family. We intend to work with everyone out there right now but to do it in a much more directed...to have a much stronger communication and much stronger coordination between these services than now currently exists.

Alderman Shea asked regarding the funding this year it is a total of about \$143,538 and obviously on the sheet you just gave to us you mentioned that the first year it is 100% funded, the second year it is 66 2/3. What does that 66 2/3 involve the \$113,000 or the in-kind?

Mr. Bolding answered it would be 66 2/3% of the \$113,210. I also want to say that this match amount is probably...the in-kind match amount is not probably it is definitely less than what it actually would be after we evaluate, analyze and report on the in-kind match made by the different players times – the JPPO's, school and ourselves. We would track that through the process of this project and be able to show how Manchester is really making an investment of existing resources to make sure that this \$113,210 would be well met by monies in the community. Furthermore, in years 2 and 3 the number that we would be looking at the Federal government matching would be 66% of \$113,210 and then approximately 33%. So during the course of the grant the commitment from the City would be the amount of the one-year budget or \$113,210.

Alderman Shea stated I am just speaking for myself. I want to compliment you. You did a fine job and I am all for the program.

Alderman Garrity asked is it strictly 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders.

Mr. Boldin answered no Sir. Frankly what we know about dropouts here in Manchester is we know there is a cliff that happens between 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade. We know that in Manchester we have an issue and we have a lot of concerns and lot of resources looking at how to reduce dropouts. One of the things that the Office of Youth Services knows is that if we have the ability to work with a family early in middle school, that is a prime age for us to engage young people. If we have the ability to actually work with them, they are much more malleable and if we can help prevent delinquency and truancy like behavior at that point we actually build stronger relationships with them and help them go through to high school. Beyond focusing services at that level we are also looking at all kids who are about to go in for a CHINS petition. Those petitions are filed by the Manchester Police

Department through referrals made by the School District and the Office of Youth Services. What we are saying is our three organizations – the School Department, the Police Department and the Office of Youth Services would sit down and work with Frank's office at the JPPO to make sure that before we actually file in court everybody is on the same page and we have literally dotted all of the I's and crossed all of the T's and tried to make sure that there is absolutely no way we could work with this family so they would not go in. At the very least, even if we chose to file a CHINS petition after that, as I am sure Frank Nugent would attest...

Alderman Garrity interjected I got it. On Page 3 of your memo, area served it says Greater Manchester. Tell me what that means. Does that mean we are going to be servicing students from Hooksett and other towns?

Mr. Boldin responded where are you looking.

Alderman Garrity replied on Page 3 at the top where it says area served. It says, "Greater Manchester."

Mr. Boldin stated one of the things we know is that there are children at our schools and there are children in the system that sometimes are not specifically in Manchester but the focus of this program is for Manchester schools and all of the residents who would come to it from the other places would also be Manchester residents.

Alderman Garrity asked so it is strictly for Manchester residents. My concern is if Manchester is going to pay the match I think we should be servicing Manchester students rather than Greater Manchester students.

Mr. Boldin answered I don't have a 100% answer for that right now. I would really have to defer...the only place I could say where we might come into a problem with that is if something happened at one of the middle schools where a child is technically living in Manchester but is a resident of another place like in a foster care situation where a child lives in a foster home in Manchester but they are a resident somewhere else. I can assure you that the main focus of the services of the Office of Youth Services in this grant will be for Manchester residents and we would be happy to report on that at any interval for the Mayor and Board of Aldermen.

Alderman Garrity stated as a School Board member for four years...

Mr. Boldin interjected John Donovan just made a good point to us. He said that we would never file a petition on someone who lives outside of Manchester.

Alderman Garrity replied thank you. Just a comment. As a School Board member I had the opportunity, although I didn't like it, we expelled many students from Hillside, Southside and Parkside and I think this is a much needed program in the middle schools and I support it wholeheartedly.

Alderman Lopez stated the only comment I want to make is I have been here for five years and this is the first time a grant has ever come in for the youth of the City of Manchester and I support this.

Alderman Smith stated Marty I commend you for this. I have great knowledge of this because I have a relative who is a youngster in the same position down in Rhode Island. I would just like to go over the cost. This is a three-year program that will be totally funded by the City in the future if we consider it worthwhile?

Mr. Boldin responded absolutely and that is our hope.

Alderman Smith stated I would just like to point out...I don't know what the cost would be but could you give me a cost of one youngster going to the Youth Development Center.

Mr. Boldin responded the approximate cost for one year at the Youth Development Center is \$125,000.

Alderman Smith stated okay I think that tells the whole story. I would like to move on this.

Chairman O'Neil responded we have a few more questions before I will accept a motion.

Alderman Gatsas asked Mr. Boldin can you tell me where you got that number of \$125,000 for YDC.

Mr. Boldin answered I researched that through Frank Nugent at the JPPO's Office. I called him up and said Frank how much does it cost for somebody to be there. He said let me call you back with the exact figure and it was \$125,000+.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't have my calculator but could somebody tell me what 120 students at \$125,000 is. That is \$15 million. It sounds excessive of what the state is spending in that department but I certainly will take your word for it and I will check it tomorrow morning. It sounds like an excessive amount because if my memory serves me incarceration at the state prison is about \$25,000/year.

Mr. Boldin asked can I just check with Frank who is the audience.

Alderman Gatsas answered you can check with him but I am pretty sure that the \$25,000 incarceration fee for a state prisoner is the right number.

Mr. Frank Nugent stated I am the Supervisor of the Juvenile Probation Parole Office in Manchester. I work for the Division of Juvenile Justice Services. Basically Marty called me the other day asking me for the rate of YDC and I talked to the fiscal specialist and was told that was a per diem rate and the figure was approximately \$123,000 based on a full year.

Alderman Gatsas stated I saw somebody in the back shaking their head when I said \$25,000 for incarceration at the state prison. Is that a correct number?

Mr. Nugent responded I don't know that. That is the Department of Corrections.

Deputy Chief Richard O'Leary stated that number of \$25,000 is correct.

Alderman Gatsas responded thank you very much. That is why I find it hard to believe that YDC is five times greater than that amount. Let's go on to further questions. You are using an awful lot of acronyms like SAP, SRO, JPPO, OYS, YDC. Right now we have troubled youths in the City of Manchester. Can you tell me how many conversations the Department of Youth Services had with the SRO's, how many sit down sessions you have had with the JPPO's and how many sit down sessions you have had with the SAP's?

Mr. Boldin replied I can't give you a specific number but what I can tell you is that we have at least weekly contact between ourselves and the Manchester Police Department. I sit on several advisory boards with Lt. Rick Reilly. John Donovan and other members from our office go down and collect data and exchange information with the Manchester Police Department. We serve and work alongside one of the SAP's at Memorial High School at the Office of Youth Services and Frank Nugent and I converse at least once a fortnight about cases and what is going on.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's go a little further. The program that you are looking to present here how close is that to the PASS Program?

Mr. Boldin responded it is different in a couple of different respects. The first thing is the whole focus of this program is to make sure that what is happening...that all of the different players are completely aware of what is going on with all of the different players with respect to the child. The PASS Program really is a single agency communicating within a single school. Our program is



looking at connecting all of the different players at all of the different agencies with the young people who are put in this process. Also, our program takes a more specific look at not just truancy behaviors but we also look at delinquency, delinquency like behaviors and behaviors that come in to our office. If I can explain just a little bit further, Alderman, one of the things that happens to us is it is almost like that game with the pop-a-mole where a family calls us because the child is acting badly at home. We start to work with the family at home and the child starts to act out school. Then somebody does something at school and then something happens in the community and a lot of these different agencies are dealing with a lot of the same kids but there is not enough communication or coordination of services.

Alderman Gatsas stated here is the problem I have. Obviously I know a little bit about the PASS Program and a little bit about the Ombudsman Program, which is basically dealing with the same kind of youth. I believe the School District pays about \$4,400 per child for that and this program here is \$5,600 with the funds depleting in years 2 and 3. I guess my question would be my understanding is that you said there has been no integration. Let me change my question. Does this grant specifically say that you must hire two employees?

Mr. Boldin responded this grant application does say that, yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the two employees that you are going to hire in year 2 would have to be paid for additionally by the City at the rate of 34% that is not being funded currently now.

Mr. Boldin answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked and in year 3 it would be at 64%.

Mr. Boldin answered 66%.

Alderman Gatsas stated so I am looking at the program saying why wouldn't we first try to integrate what we are doing now with the people that we have there because we are talking about 20 youths and if we have had no integration in talking to the SRO's or the JPPO's why wouldn't we make that attempt first before we get a grant and have to worry about what we do with the employees in a year?

Mr. Boldin stated I can speak for the Office of Youth Services. The needs that are in front of us are complex. The cases that we work with require a tremendous amount of attention and expertise. The service delivery system that is out there right now is depleted. There are programs that are fighting for funding. There are

resources that are not there that were there before. By requesting this money what we are trying to do is not build a new program but we are trying to provide a resource that will help many programs do their job better. This is the best way I can think of to use this money to help as many agencies and as many troubled youth as possible. I understand that there are other needs and other resources out there but putting together the minds of the School District, the Police Department and the JPPO's, this is the idea that bubbled to the top among all of the ideas that are out there as a way to really help the youth of the City.

Chairman O'Neil stated Dr. Bass is here as well as Karen Burkush and I don't know if they have anything to add on behalf of the School District.

Dr. Frank Bass stated in response to Alderman Gatsas' comment I think if you look at the Ombudsman Program it is more of an academic oriented program. Our concern is getting those students up to speed academically primarily with the guidance counselors at our school as well as the Ombudsman people in terms of generating an individual learning plan that is going to be helpful for them. The PASS Program is a most unique program. That program is spearheaded by Jim Schubert who is the Director of our Alternative Education Program for the City of Manchester. That is more of an in-house program that deals with 80 or 90 kids throughout the day and it brings in a variety of resources. Again, it is still primarily academically based. What this program is promoting to do is to connect up with the City services of the Police Department as well as the court system and we are talking about caseloads here. This is as I think Marty pointed out there is a great deal of behind-the-scenes work that goes on with these kids and their families that is well beyond the purview of the school to be working with the families and the court system and the Police Department in the manner and in the time that this program is attempting to do. I think we are excited about the program because it is going to reach out to a certain population that we don't get a chance to reach out to all that often and before we even get to them in many cases they are already taken by the court. This, I think, is a nice opportunity for us to turn around some of our more difficult cases. I think that is why we are excited and I don't know if Karen wants to add anything.

Mrs. Karen Burkush stated the only thing I would add is that this program looks more like a case management program and would really help out the School District in that we have one full-time truant officer so these folks, these two new case workers, will probably be able to double our ability to go out...actually they will have 16 kids to start that they will be watching who will be taken off the truant officer's caseload so it will be very helpful for us. The only other thing I would add is being a member of the Greater Manchester Wrap Around Team we have seen tremendous progress and tremendous results of having Wrap Around for

families of kids. We all get together and say what can we do for these kinds and what are the resources in the City. I think those are the two important things.

Alderman Shea asked how are you going to select the people. Do they have to meet certain criteria?

Mr. Boldin answered yes. One of the things we have learned through working with CARE NH, which is the Wrap Around model here in this City that has outstanding results is...to make a long story short the people that need to facilitate this process need to have approximately the same type of qualifications that we look for in youth service counselors at the Office of Youth Services. Having just gone through the process of bringing somebody on board we would go through that process again where we fill out an application, wait for the applications to come in, interview people and then introduce them to the team to see if they would be the best candidate for the job.

Alderman Shea asked if the approval is given when would this project begin.

Mr. Boldin answered this is an extraordinarily competitive grant so once the team votes on it if we get the permission to move forward...the application is due on May 13. We would probably have an answer some time by the end of July or beginning of August from the state and the grant cycle usually begins on October 1.

Alderman Shea asked it is a grant from the state.

Mr. Boldin answered it is a grant from the Federal government monitored through the Division of Juvenile Justice Services at the state.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mrs. Burkush, you said that you were part of the Wrap team.

Mrs. Burkush answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked where are the meetings held.

Mrs. Burkush answered we have been holding them down at DCYF at 361 Lincoln Street but they are actually moving to Goffstown and I am not sure tomorrow if we are going to Goffstown or our next meeting. We meet twice a month.

Alderman Gatsas stated and I assume these family oriented meetings that you are going to have with the parent/child is going to be at the Youth Offices.

Mr. Boldin responded we will provide those services in the best possible location for the family. One of the principals of this is to try to keep it family driven. We will go to where the family is.

Alderman Gatsas stated well obviously the space that you have at the Office of Youth Services, the offices that I saw, you would have a very difficult time getting a family of three in any one of those rooms.

Mr. Boldin responded yes, Sir.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am not saying that...I think that if you are trying to save youth that are in a very difficult situation that we would be looking at space that might have some windows and a room that you can get more than three people into. It is not your fault and that is a conversation that I have been having with members of this Board because I think that the Rines Center should be accommodating you with some better space.

Mrs. Burkush stated currently the Greater Manchester Wrap Around is run by Mrs. Robinson through the county and that is why we are moving to Goffstown because their office got relocated. We actually do have a big space and transportation for families should they need to get there.

Chairman O'Neil stated before I entertain a motion I have a couple of comments or questions. I want to clarify that the grant is 100% the first year and one of the reasons you are looking for some direction or commitment tonight is the cost to the City the second year is approximately \$38,000 give or take and the third year it is approximately \$75,000. Am I correct?

Mr. Boldin answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated so there will be future commitments from the City.

Mr. Boldin answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the things I am very pleased about is any time we can get the School District, Karen Burkush, Frank Bass, the Police Department, Deputy O'Leary, Lt. Reilly and we even have two of our greatest resources in Manchester – Judy Cooper and Dan Duval here supporting it, Frank Nugent from the state, our entire Youth Services staff, John Donovan and yourself. This has got to be the right thing. It doesn't happen regularly so to me that was the clear sign. We had everybody on the same page and that is a great thing for the kids in this City.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to recommend that the Director of Youth be allowed to apply for an OJJDP Delinquency Prevention Formula Grant through the State of NH for the Wrap for Youth Resiliency (WYR) Project.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will poll the full Board and coordinate with the City Clerk's Office. The Committee itself doesn't have that power but I don't expect there will be a problem.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$47,358 (CDBG) for the FY2003 CIP 610403 Downtown Municipal Infrastructure Project.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$25,098.98 (CDBG) for the FY2004 CIP 510604 Neighborhood Playground Rehabilitation Project.

Alderman Garrity moved to approve the resolution and budget authorizations. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we have a game plan regarding the parks that qualify for CDBG and is there some plan that we are trying to follow.

Mr. Robert MacKenzie answered yes. We had actually followed the original RAP plan back in 1990 and we have actually done all of the parks over at least one that are eligible for CDBG funding.

Chairman O'Neil asked is RAP the Recovery Action Plan or another plan.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is the Recovery Action Plan.

Chairman O'Neil asked how come there are some inner City parks like the Central practice field and that that don't get taken care of.

Mr. Ron Johnson stated the Central practice field was done as part of a renovation. When we were doing Beech Street School we did that in several stages and

actually the practice field was done probably about six years ago. That included new fencing. We also had the issue of the service to Beech Street School for the School Food and Nutrition Program. We corrected some problems there, put sidewalks in the back alley, which is now called Jumbo Riley Way.

Chairman O'Neil asked sidewalk.

Mr. Johnson answered yes. There is a sidewalk that lines up with Hunt Pool and parallels the field with new fencing.

Chairman O'Neil responded I can't say that I have ever seen a sidewalk there but I will take your word for it.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve the resolution and budget authorizations. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Bruce Thomas, Engineering Manager, requesting the approval of the Chronic Drain Projects as outlined herein, subject to availability of funding.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to approve the chronic drain projects subject to availability of funding.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Ron Ludwig, Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery, requesting authorization to procure two vehicles through the State of NH procurement process to replace a 1988 panel van and a 1987 station wagon.

Alderman Lopez moved to approve the request. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated last night we were talking about vehicles for different departments and you are going to get two vehicles, Ron, for \$30,000. Good for you. That is what I say. I know we had a lengthy discussion, Mr. Chairman, about how much we were paying.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Review and discussion of the proposed FY2005 CIP budget.

- f) communication from the Deputy Public Works Director regarding landfill post closure monitoring funding;

Chairman O'Neil stated my recommendation per discussion with the Finance Officer and the Deputy Director of Public Works is this is really an operating budget issue. We need to refer it to the Highway operating budget but keep in mind it is \$120,000. I would like to entertain a motion to refer that to the Finance Committee.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to refer this item to the Finance Committee.

Chairman O'Neil stated keep in mind that is not in the Highway Department budget right now. Kevin, am I correct to say that we have to do this under state law?

Mr. Kevin Sheppard responded yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have a number of communications from Aldermen. I don't know that we need to read them into the record but we need to start having some discussion about framework for the CIP budget. We need a recommendation from the Highway Department on the building improvements, which is on Page 1 of Table 4, General Obligations. The project number is 811405. The recommendation from the Highway Department or their request is that that be an expedited bond.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we need some type of presentation here. We are talking about \$3.2 million for the Library and I think we need to know what that entails. I have heard rumors that it entails air conditioning and everything else.

Mr. Sheppard stated we actually went out and got an engineering study put together for this and to put together an estimate for that project and that was the basis for the number in the CIP budget. I am not prepared tonight to make a presentation. I have a copy of that engineering report and if the CIP Committee wants I could pass out copies of that report. If you want to do this at a later date we could do a presentation.

Alderman Lopez replied the problem I have is I need a complete breakdown of what we are spending \$3 million on and is it true that there is air conditioning. I

have heard as much as \$1 million of air conditioning going in there versus air exchange. I need something.

Mr. Sheppard responded the estimate is approximately \$3 million to air condition the Library plus replace the heating piping as part of that project to go to a hydronic system versus steam.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we and this might be a question for Mr. MacKenzie or Mr. Clougherty, can we expedite...do we have to expedite all of the projects listed or can we expedite if there is a problem or concern with one project can we expedite the balance of them.

Mr. MacKenzie answered in order to do that we would have to separate out the project and create a new one. I don't think given that these are very large projects...normally we try to aggregate these in order to get a larger bond, which makes it easier to finance. I think these are relatively large projects and we could split them out. It would take a little bit more time. It is getting late to expedite these projects though. I think even if the Committee took an action today it would be late June before the project actually goes through the process and the bond resolutions are adopted.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin do you concur with that.

Mr. Kevin Clougherty responded yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked so the recommendation is to not expedite them. I am looking at like roof replacement. The longer we wait it would be great to get some of these roofing projects going late summer or early fall so they are done before winter.

Mr. MacKenzie responded I think expediting would only save two weeks in this case. Normally we would try to have this up and ready July 1. At the present time it has to go to the full Board at a regular meeting and it has to layover so it is possible that it would not be approved as an expedited project until the second meeting in June. So at this point we are saving two weeks. We will try to do that if that is imperative.

Mr. Sheppard stated that is fine. If that is the case we will wait as long as we can get the money hopefully in the beginning of July.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will schedule...I am sure we are going to have another CIP meeting and we are going to have to schedule a presentation on the Library.



Alderman Shea stated I find it very disconcerting that we are sitting here tonight and this is dated January 30 and we are just getting a copy tonight. We are trying to make decisions. I think that every member of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen should get a copy of this. Listed here is \$2.98 for the Library. That isn't fair when we are trying to make decisions that are fair to everyone. I hate to keep using the term taxpayers but it is just not fair that we are receiving this tonight Kevin. I don't blame you maybe but people have to make decisions.

Mr. Sheppard replied I don't disagree with that statement. This was done as part of the Mayor's budget and that is why I agreed to pass it out tonight and that we can make a presentation at a later date. I don't disagree with that statement. I am not asking...I agree that maybe we should make a presentation as Alderman Lopez said. That way you have this information and you can look at it before the presentation is made versus having it when the presentation is being made.

Alderman Shea responded I am not shooting the messenger.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I have reviewed the Board's calendar and if you wanted to expedite those projects or a project you could expedite it and have it all adopted as early as the 24<sup>th</sup> of this month. It would require the resolutions being submitted to the Board for next week but you could pull this one out of the CIP and you could expedite it and you could put it forward and bring it to the Board next week along with the bond resolutions. We have done it in the past. It all depends on how quickly people can get a resolution done up. In essence you pull it out of your FY05 and amend your FY04 and bring in a bond resolution all on May 18 and then on May 24 when the Finance Committee meets you could have a Special Meeting of the Board following it and adopt that and anything else you wanted. It is an option that you have. It is a matter of whether the Committee wants us to pursue it in that fashion and you would have to make the recommendation of expediting the project and pulling it out and we could take care of the reports from there.

Alderman Lopez stated Mr. MacKenzie I am just surprised that we don't have any back-up material. We are spending \$4 million but we don't have any back-up whatsoever. We have \$985,000 for roof replacement. Is that one roof? Ten roofs?

Mr. MacKenzie responded we do have large amounts of back-up information and are very happy to provide it rapidly. The CIP Committee has not met yet to start talking about the CIP but any information you would like we can have to you within the next couple of days.

Alderman Lopez replied that is fair. The one that I am really concerned about is the Library and the \$3 million we are going to spend there. What is the mechanism? I know in the schools they didn't have air in the classroom and they had an air exchange. Tim Clougherty is not here tonight is he?

Mr. Sheppard responded no and he would probably be the one making the presentation.

Alderman Lopez stated that is what I am concerned with.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will put together as quick as possible a CIP meeting. Are there any others on the building improvements that you want a presentation on? They can get a breakdown of...I am guessing the majority of the roof replacement is schools. I don't know if it is exclusively schools. My understanding on the Police Station improvement pre-cooling unit, plaza, deck renovations and cellblock renovations, security issues speak for themselves, as do the furnishings at the elderly center. Do you want a presentation on anything else other than the Library?

Alderman Lopez responded no. I think Mr. MacKenzie can provide the back-up information on the other stuff. Can we deal with another one?

Chairman O'Neil replied well I have another suggestion for an expedited and that is if you go up to Highway Department Public Works Infrastructure 710205. In my discussion today with Mr. Sheppard there are four projects that he has asked be expedited. Those are Street Reconstruction at \$145,000; Brown Avenue at \$175,000; the Discretionary Sidewalks at \$350,000; and the 50/50 Sidewalk Program at \$50,000.

Alderman Shea moved to expedite the above mentioned projects. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated in reference to 710205 the one I question is Car Impound lot for \$200,000. What are we talking about and where are we talking about?

Mr. Sheppard responded you are probably aware that we have had problems with the towing of vehicles during the winter months. We used to tow them to South Commercial Street but now that land is no longer available. We have had discussions with the Parks Department to potentially create a parking lot up at Derryfield Park and during the winter months we could use that for towing operations.

Alderman Lopez asked where.

Mr. Sheppard answered one area we were looking at is the southeast corner right off Bridge Street across from Trinity High School. I guess it was potentially a location for the senior center at one point.

Alderman Lopez stated my next question is for the Parks Department. Ron, if that became a reality and that is park land are you going to have to replace it and is that the best place for thousands of people coming to the City of Manchester to see an impound parking lot there?

Mr. Ron Ludwig responded that is a two part question and to answer the first part we feel that a parking lot wouldn't require the same action or exclusion as a building would in terms of it being placed in that area. We have talked with Highway and they came in with an informal plan of putting some parking up there. Our original thought was that probably this was not the best place to put an impound lot but I think the word impound kind of sends a different signal. It kind of makes it sound like a junkyard with a dog and a bone in it or something and it is not really that. It is a lot that gets used...it is our understanding as the Highway Department represented it that it gets used four or five times a year during critical storms when their towing activities are large. If you look at the other side of that and they did come in with a plan as I said that looked like a lot of asphalt and we asked them to revisit it and try to leave some buffer there on Bridge Street and do it in a different way but it would supplement the parking at Derryfield. As you know at the Al Lemire Complex in the fall when the East Cobras are there we have track meets there and parking is a huge problem there so this would offset some of that and create some additional parking that would be well needed up there. I think if it is done right with the tree buffers left along Bridge Street so that it is in the woods a little bit it could happen. My long-term theory is that if someday we needed open space or green space it is just asphalt and we could just take it back. I know once you put something in place it is pretty difficult to take back but maybe another location down the road will come into play down in the inner City where it is more convenient to tow to. I am not sure but they are in a bit of a bind to look for a place right now and it is not the worst situation in my opinion.

Alderman Lopez asked wouldn't Gill Stadium make a good impound lot. It is only used about 10 times a year anyway.

Mr. Ludwig responded what I can tell you about the Gill lot during the winter is it is pretty much an impound lot except the cars aren't being towed there. They are all being placed there by residents right off of Green, Grove and those streets where parking isn't available. Again I know that we have alternate street parking but a lot of these people get confused and they can't figure that out and they come

to the Gill lot. So basically the Gill lot at least from the entrance to JFK on Beech Street in a southerly direction down to Valley is pretty much used by residents in the neighborhood. In fact, we usually wait a few days after the storm to plow it and then post it so they will move their cars. When a snow emergency is in effect, the Gill lot gets full.

Chairman O'Neil stated this is a pretty serious issue. Because of the baseball project they had to move out of Singer Park. They went to the Arms lot for one storm. That didn't work out. You went back to Singer Park for this year but we know that the baseball stadium is going to be built there. We have to find a spot for this.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with you and I brought it up and there was a Committee formed and they were going to solve the problem and this is the first I have heard through the grapevine...

Chairman O'Neil interjected who is on the Committee that has been formed.

Alderman Lopez responded Frank Thomas was the head of the Committee to find a location but this is the first I have heard of the location through the grapevine.

Chairman O'Neil stated the recommendation is to expedite those four projects.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many cars are towed to that impound lot.

Mr. Sheppard answered we can tow anywhere between 200-400 cars during a snowstorm.

Alderman Gatsas stated I assume when you are talking about an impound lot it is going to have fencing around it.

Mr. Sheppard responded not necessarily. That is one of the concerns that the Parks Department had. Let me just give a little history. We took a look at this because we are familiar with Derryfield Park a little bit. My daughter runs track up there. We know the need for parking up there and there has been an issue for an impound lot. I think Ron is right when you call it an impound lot it is not a junkyard. When cars are towed there they are gone with 12-24 hours. They are towed to the off-site towing companies lots if they are not picked up by the owner. What we would be looking at is probably creating a curb around the edge or sometime of landscaping around the edge so people can't be driving their vehicles out of there except through the designated entrance or exit. We wouldn't be taking a look at putting up a fence. The Parks Department actually brought that to our attention. We would be trying to make this look like a parking lot for

Derryfield Park that could be utilized during the winter for towing vehicles. Like Ron said maybe the five to seven times that we do tow during the winter. We want to work with the Parks Department and design something aesthetically that would fit into Derryfield Park.

Alderman Gatsas asked is this impound lot manned by somebody so that if Ted Gatsas goes up to get his car there is someone there 24 hours a day.

Mr. Sheppard answered as soon as we start towing the towing companies man that lot along with a police officer until the last vehicle is out of there. It is manned.

Alderman Gatsas asked most of your cars are towed from the inner City correct.

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated if you towed my car how do you expect me to get to my car to get it out of the impound lot if I am down on Hollis Street.

Mr. Sheppard responded that was one of the biggest concerns – trying to find a location that people can get to. It is a difficult situation for the people that are being towed. Getting to the location or paying for a taxi to get to that location is not the thing they want on top of paying that fine. Out of everyplace we have looked this is probably the closest we could find that has the size.

Alderman Gatsas asked doesn't the Manchester Transit Authority have an awful lot of vacant space down there.

Mr. Sheppard replied I think someone from MTA is here and I think the answer is no.

Mr. David Smith stated currently our lot is full. We do have a storage lot on the corner of our property that has a number of City cars and trucks in it, both active and inactive. There is no excess space at this point.

Alderman Gatsas asked don't you have...isn't there space down there with trees that could be excavated to get us some space. How many acres do you have down there?

Mr. Smith answered 8.4. Some of it is in the hillside.

Alderman Gatsas stated and it is not all consumed by what you are on now.

Mr. Smith responded no. Off on one corner there is a small woodsy area.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the chances of going down there and excavating some area where we could put cars wouldn't be absurd to take a look at.

Mr. Smith answered it would require some settling up with the Federal government because of their interest in the property.

Alderman Gatsas asked we already have vehicles on one corner right.

Mr. Smith answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked did we settle up for that.

Mr. Smith answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many vehicles are there now.

Mr. Smith answered 20 or so.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you think that there would be a problem settling up with the Federal government if we did some excavation to get some area where we could put an impound lot at that end of the City because that obviously is not far from where most of the cars are towed.

Mr. Smith answered in my review of the records I believe that the value of the property consumed by that parking lot that was built for those 20 cars was about \$70,000 that was paid back to the Federal government.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we are within that \$200,000 range that is in the CIP budget.

Chairman O'Neil asked did you say, Mr. Smith, that in order to get it there had to be a payment of \$70,000 to the Federal government.

Mr. Smith answered yes. The Federal government has an 80% interest in the property and the building and if any of that is used for a non-transit purpose then it requires buy back of their interest in that portion of the property.

Mr. Sheppard stated can I recommend that we work with the Parks Department and put together a preliminary plan to satisfy some of the needs of the park as well as our needs and we can bring it back. Like I said we look at that not as an impound lot but more as a parking lot for Derryfield Park that could be used five or seven times during the winter months. Obviously we would maintain that lot

and in the spring get it cleaned up. I have been down to impound lots in the past and it is not a dirty lot where you find mufflers, etc. These vehicles are towed there and they are taken out typically the next day.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to expedite four projects from 710205 Public Works Infrastructure - \$145,000 Street Reconstruction; \$175,000 Brown Avenue; \$350,000 Discretionary Sidewalks and \$50,000 50/50 Program. I will call for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a couple of other notes. In discussion with the Planning Department, the Highway Department and the Fire Department and I don't know if Mr. MacKenzie has a recommendation tonight but there has been some discussion that the number to rehab the South Main Street Fire Station may be more appropriate at \$1.6 million. Bob, have we had a chance to figure out how we would do that?

Mr. MacKenzie responded I know we discussed the issue and felt that we should have a more detailed analysis done. That more detailed analysis was just under \$1.4 million. It may be good to have a little more slack to make sure this project is done correctly. We have not identified any other bond funds. We have started preliminarily to review all of our old bond projects to see if there is any available funding but have not identified anything yet.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding is that we really need to get that number up to somewhere around \$1.6 million. The \$1.4 million is not going to be adequate. We need to look at that.

Alderman Shea stated I have a question for Kevin Sheppard. Last night we had lengthy discussions concerning vehicle replacement for the Police and Fire Departments and under your major fleet upgrades of the \$2.5 million does any of that include Police or Fire upgrading of vehicles or anything?

Mr. Sheppard responded the recommendation would include one ladder truck for the Fire Department...I passed out to the City Clerk a little bit earlier our recommendations should it come up tonight. It does not include any Police vehicles because those are not bondable vehicles. I believe the Finance Department typically considers anything under \$50,000 to \$60,000 be a cash item.

Alderman Shea stated so basically it is for the snow melter, the transit buses that you listed and the firetruck for Engine 3 and dumptrucks for the Highway Department along with sweepers and a lawnmower for Parks and Recreation. Okay. So it has nothing to do with Fire or Police.

Chairman O'Neil responded well it does have to do with the Fire Department. The truck is a bondable item.

Alderman Shea replied but that is not what we were talking about last night.

Alderman Smith stated since the proposed rehabilitation of the fire station is in my ward and this is the first time that I have heard the price has gone up my contention would be either we do it on a two year bond and start this year or if not we could probably get the funds from the ventilation of the Library to fund the fire station. I would think safety is more important than anything else.

Chairman O'Neil stated this might be an appropriate time to bring Mr. Clougherty up and Mr. MacKenzie to talk about the kind of new approach we are taking on a two-year CIP. I know that was a concern of Alderman Lopez. Just try to set the framework for what we are attempting to accomplish here.

Mr. MacKenzie stated just to reiterate some of what was discussed in the Mayor's budget message we had some key projects this year and it was felt that it would be hard to phase those, particularly the Memorial field, which is a \$4.4 million project. We have roughly \$10 million under the guidance of the Bond Counsel that we have available each year. In order to accomplish Memorial field and several of the other projects it was felt by the staff and the Mayor's Office that we could do a two-year bond budget. So we did recommend a 20 year \$20 million bond budget. We have expedited \$4.4 million of that already for Memorial field. It does require some restraint, though, on the Board since it is a two-year budget. Unless we have found money or find some other sources in the next two years this program that we are proposing here will be a two-year budget. As such we will have to...if there are emergencies that come up we will have to try to trap other ways to do it but at this point Bond Counsel is recommending that we stick to \$20 million over two years.

Mr. Kevin Clougherty stated I think Bob covered it pretty well. What we are trying to do is say to the Board in light of where the markets are maybe you want to consider doing something at the front end of the two year period rather than at the back end. If you want to do that, that is okay as long as you understand you have the \$20 million and it is not going to change. If you want to spend it all this year or next year or however you want to divide that up. We do have a rather in-depth debt presentation that we do want to make for the Committee. We will explain in graphic form with a series of charts where your debt is and how we came to this \$20 million. It is not just a number that we grabbed out of the sky. We will explain what that means in the future and how that money changes in the second year. The factors that affect your second year debt would be your



evaluations and things of that nature. We would like to make that presentation at the earliest possible convenience of the Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to see that presentation, along with others. The question I have for you, Kevin, on the two year bonding...where everything is just thrown on here and we are going to go through a couple of presentations on some of this if we approve the two-year bonding of \$15.6 because we already did Memorial and we subtract that from the \$20 million, how do we keep \$1 million or \$2 million aside if we don't want to do that project? Can we still utilize it? For example, if we find that there is \$1 million in air conditioning for the Library and we don't want that can we transfer that within that whole two years or a certain period of time. Sort of like a contingency in case something comes up. How do we do that?

Mr. Clougherty responded it is the same rules that you follow now. If you want to transfer a bond balance if you feel that there is a project that you don't want to follow you can allocate that with a vote of the Board to something else. The bottom line for us is that you have \$20 million. If you want to spend \$15 million this year or \$20 million this year then you won't have that next year. Again, as those projects get done and come on line and there are balances then certainly you can allocate those in a subsequent time period.

Alderman Lopez stated I just don't want to leave the impression that with most of these projects here they are all approved and everybody things they have everything in place and we haven't had a chance to really take a great look at it. It was just brought to my attention about the items in the Library for example. There is a whole page here that is not even included – furniture, design fees, etc. and we are spending \$2 million and this is not even included. I think that we have to look at this thing to make sure that...they are going to come back and ask for another \$3 million and when are they are going to get it you know.

Mr. Clougherty responded again if the decision is to spend the \$20 million this year then you are not going to have much flexibility next year. It would be the following year unless some of the underlying items that we would explain in the debt presentation like your valuation would increase or something that would give us more capacity or justification for issuing more debt.

Alderman Lopez replied I just wanted to clear that up and I await your presentation because I think it is very important.

Chairman O'Neil asked can I use an example. We were going to renovate City Hall and we identified \$5 million to do it. I am just using this as an example and we list City Hall Renovations at \$5 million. Until we actually have committed to a

consultant to design it, once we do that we are going to have to pay that money out of the bond and if we decided at that point not to go forward then that money could be available for other projects correct? So really until a commitment is made on these projects it is really just a place to hold that dollar figure. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is correct. The critical point really is the award of the construction contract. Once you pass that point it is very difficult to pull back or very costly. The City has changed direction on certain projects after the design has been paid for and it has that ability to once it weighs how much it has already spent. So yes you may change direction on a project.

Alderman Smith asked in regards to the general obligation bonds you people had a survey and you got together with all of the department heads and they had their laundry list and so forth like that and it comes up to \$15.6 million. That means there is no recourse for next year to do anything. I would like to know how you put these items on the CIP budget. Can you explain that to me?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we go through a process where each department submits a fairly long list of projects they feel are important. We ask them to prioritize each of those projects so for example the Highway Department would have some 38 projects let's say. Some of those projects we then divvy up depending on potential funding source and can it be bonded or does it have to be cash or could it be paid for by HUD sources or other grants. We separate those requests into pools. We then meet with the department and review all of the projects and provide information to the Mayor at that point. To the extent we can, we follow the priorities of the department. Sometimes that is not possible. Sometimes a department wants a very major project as their number one priority but we simply don't have the money and we move to the number two priority but to the extent possible we work with each department. We understand the importance of each of these projects and we work with the Mayor and recommend to the Mayor projects based on those departmental priorities.

Alderman Smith asked how do you come up with the exact figures. Do the department heads give you the amounts of money because it seems like a lot of projects we have like the senior center we okay a certain amount and then find out it is going to cost more. Where do you get your information? Is it from the financial people in the department or do you guys look at it?

Mr. MacKenzie answered that primarily relates to construction projects. We do get the information from the departments. If we have a question we may go back and ask them to get a more detailed cost breakdown. Some departments have a

fairly good track record of cost estimating. We try to use our judgement and when necessary we call in some experts to do more detailed cost accounting.

Alderman Smith asked so if it is going to be imminent that we are going to do this particular project, we will have all of the figures and they will not change or else we won't approve the project. Is that what you are saying? I don't want to see what happened to the senior center happen to other projects. I was all for the senior center but it kind of hard getting all of the money they need to put that on line.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes actually the senior center has been fairly close to the original budget. The only slight increase in that project was the actual appraisal value of some of the buildings we were acquiring were above what was in our assessments. The construction costs are right on the button for the senior center. We do try to use some judgement. We try to build in a little bit of slack but we don't normally build in a lot of slack for each project.

Chairman O'Neil stated in just sitting here thinking about this what we may have to do is on some of these capital projects is approve design money and have them come back with good estimates before we approve construction money where in the past we kind of threw everything together and let them go. We may have to have a little more control over it or checks and balances going forward. It is going to take a little more discipline on the Committee's part and a little more work for the staff but it might be the appropriate way to address some of those concerns so we don't get ourselves in trouble.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Kevin, when are you preparing to give your analysis of where we are with bonding ability. Do you plan on giving it to the full Finance Committee or just CIP?

Mr. Clougherty answered we are prepared to do that a moment's notice. We have the presentation ready and as we said we are ready to bring that in so as soon as the Board wants, let us know and we will be there.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think we are three weeks from finalizing the budget and this is the biggest component of what we need to be talking about. I don't know how we can even be looking at CIP numbers without knowing where we are going into a two-year number.

Chairman O'Neil responded I think we know where we are going. It is requiring us to be a little more disciplined. I think this is beyond just the two year CIP budget.

Mr. Clougherty replied right. It is talking about the program and generally where you are with debt. There have been some questions over time as to how all of these pieces fit together so this will give you a good understanding.

Chairman O'Neil stated my recommendation would be that it is a bigger issue than the CIP Committee and it probably needs to be made to the full Board. We can communicate with the Mayor's Office and see if he wants to do it at the full Board meeting next week or when we are in Finance Committee.

Mr. MacKenzie stated to add on to that once that analysis is provided the staff is working and looking into the future with departments five years out and we will want to have that discussion, what we call the multi-year budget, in a few weeks to show you some of the major projects coming down the road. It takes a long time to plan projects now. Projects can last two years or three years and sometimes six years. We do want to give you a heads up of what is coming down the pike and give you a full preview of that. The Board doesn't have to take any appropriation action on it but we will provide it to the Board for information. That is probably a month away.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't know if we ever got an answer to this question but the Fire Department, can they weigh in on this 411305. Are we talking about renovation? Are we talking about a new fire station? You know how much money we spend on renovations. Maybe you know off the top of your head what the new station cost us.

Fire Chief Kane responded we are talking about renovation of that station. We did look at that area for reconstructing the building and building a new building and there wasn't adequate area over there and the cost of building a new building over there was substantially higher. This will be a complete renovation of the structure, roof, windows interior and that type of thing.

Chairman O'Neil stated in a discussion you and I had you did go through and kind of look at other City owned property in the area and could a station fit there, how does that change response times for that station, etc. Maybe not as formally as you have done in the past when we have actually hired a consultant to do some of that but you did go through that procedure.

Chief Kane replied we did do that and we did that in-house. We basically looked at that area and there were basically several areas that we looked at it and every time we looked at them there was an obstacle to that area that prevented us from doing that.

Alderman Lopez asked is this something that the City is going to do, not the Fire Department and when I say City I am talking about the City engineers.

Chief Kane answered usually the way we do that is the Fire Department works in conjunction with them and certainly we work very closely with the City Engineer, Tim Clougherty, over at the Highway Department. The projects that we have done in the past in that manner seem to have gone fairly well.

Chairman O'Neil stated the only thing that would change is if that reorganization ends up getting approve it would be Fire and Highway working together and instead of Fire being the procurement department it would be Highway but they would be working hand in hand. I am sure Deputy Chief Monnelly would be the one who is generally involved in that stuff and he and Tim Clougherty would be working hand in hand as they have on other projects.

Chief Kane responded it really doesn't matter to us where the project ends up. We certainly have a great working relationship with those people and we work closely with them.

Alderman Lopez asked the \$1.3 million and you indicated that it might need to be \$1.6 million but to get this project started you are still going to need a construction engineer to go in and have an architect...

Mr. MacKenzie interjected yes. We have just had at this point an architect walk through the building and do some quick visual reviews. He is an architect that has worked on other stations in Manchester. One the Board approved it we would hire an architect who would work with Fire and Highway to develop plans and specs and have a very detailed process. Again, the cost estimate now is about \$1.38 million so it is a little bit higher than this number. I think it would be good to build in a little bit of cushion just to make sure that once we get to the construction we have adequate money.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the things I recall from my conversations with the Chief is there was an issue about a little more structural review and if I recall that could be worth \$100,000 or something. Does that sound right?

Chief Kane responded you are correct in that.

Chairman O'Neil stated that was one of the reasons to get the number up in case we have to do those structural...I thought I was told it was the first concrete floor fire station in the City or something to that effect.

Chief Kane responded I don't have that number with me.

Chairman O'Neil stated again I think going forward we are going to have to be disciplined and allow some money for design and then bring it back and see where it fits with what we have identified. It may slow up the process a little bit but if we have our T's crossed and our I's dotted we should be a little more efficient with it maybe.

Mr. Clougherty stated plus you are getting those financial reports on projects and you could be tracking them every meeting and that should help.

Alderman Roy stated I have a question for Kevin. In last year's FY04 the Fire Department had \$270,000 for installation of automatic fire sprinkler system and central fire and design services for Hackett Hill or South Main Street. Is that still available or has that been appropriated out in other places?

Chief Kane stated that project is currently well in process. We have design people on board and we are currently going out to bid. We are anticipating that it will be \$200,000 and there may be some money left over that we could use for the South Main Street Station but there won't be a lot of funds.

Alderman Gatsas asked can somebody explain to me "Hands Across America."

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. There are actually two recommended chunks. \$250,000 of that would be new bond money. \$750,000 would be a bond transfer. The bond transfer would come from the bonded indebtedness for the Canal Street Garage. With the sale of the property, the cash balance of that went into the one time revenue fund but there is a bond balance that the Board has to transfer. A portion of that bond balance the Board used to complete certain items at Gill Stadium so the balance is roughly \$750,000. It has to go towards a long life capital project.

Alderman Gatsas asked could we move some of that to the South Main Street Fire Station that Alderman Smith wants and probably find some other funds from other projects because those are current funds in play and not funds that we have to bond with debt.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked so is that part of your \$20 million or is that outside the \$20 million.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is outside the \$20 million. The \$750,000 is outside.

Alderman Gatsas asked if we go and look at total indebtedness that we see in the CIP for funding projects for two years am I going to see \$20 million or in excess of \$20 million.

Mr. MacKenzie answered you will see \$20 million because the \$750,000 was already bonded in a previous year.

Alderman Gatsas asked is the \$750,000 part of the \$2.4 million that I am seeing next to "See Table 1." The \$2.430 million?

Mr. MacKenzie answered no it is not.

Alderman Gatsas asked are there any other projects in here that have bond balances. Explain to me that \$750,000 again. It comes from the Canal Street Garage?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. The City still had an outstanding debt on the garage. That is a bond balance. Technically the City could go through a process called defeasing a bond but I think Kevin would tell you that is a very difficult process and perhaps a costly process so the best approach in that case is to take that bond balance or that bond capacity and apply it towards another capital project with at least a 20 year life.

Alderman Gatsas replied let's go a little slower because I am a little slow.

Mr. MacKenzie responded maybe Kevin could explain it differently.

Alderman Gatsas stated well maybe we can explain it so that everybody can explain it because I am not sure I understand it.

Mr. Clougherty stated we had a project that you issued debt for.

Alderman Gatsas replied let's start from the beginning and let me just ask a couple of questions so I can get clear in my mind what road we are on. We sold the garage and I don't remember the price but let's use a round number of \$3 million. If there was a debt of \$750,000, that is the \$750,000 we are talking about so when we got paid \$3 million instead of retiring the debt of \$750,000...

Mr. Clougherty interjected right. You are transferring that balance to another 20 year project and the proceeds were deposited into the one time revenue fund.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much is the \$750,000 allocated to indebtedness. What is that debt service cost for \$750,000?

Mr. Clougherty responded I can get that for you.

Alderman Gatsas stated my question is obviously that has to be short-term debt. Either a lot of principal was being paid to that \$750,000 or do we have to refinance...

Mr. Clougherty interjected you have already allocated that. It is a balance of a prior bond issue so when you look at that it is not going to be like you are issuing new short-term debt. It is already outstanding and you are reallocating it.

Alderman Gatsas replied I understand what you are saying but obviously if the 20 year debt on that garage was down to five years remaining for the \$750,000 then the majority of the payment back would be principal based on the schemes that you do for bonding.

Mr. Clougherty responded that may not be true, Alderman, because again we do try to level principal and interest so that may not be true. Until I look at that particular project and how it was structured we won't know that answer but I can get that for you. I will look at that tomorrow.

Alderman Gatsas asked so whatever situation we are looking to do with the \$750,000 and I am just using a round number and I know you have to look at it but if there were five years left on that \$750,000 we would really be looking for a deal to pay off in five years and not twenty because it doesn't have a twenty year capacity on the bond.

Mr. Clougherty answered that is right.

Alderman Gatsas stated you were going down a road and Mr. MacKenzie said you might be able to explain it better.

Mr. Clougherty responded I thought I did. We sold the garage and the garage proceeds went to the one time revenue fund and I think you understand what we are talking about now. That is all I was going to talk about.

Alderman Gatsas asked why wouldn't we pay off the debt.

Mr. Clougherty answered in order to defees the debt you would have to go through a process of calling the bonds and going to the market and just the cost of dealing with that preparation of the documents and the legal costs it is not worth it. Plus if you did that you would defees it and if you had that capacity you would go out and issue something new. We are really just trying to be efficient in what we have



outstanding and reallocate it for a purpose that is allowable under the IRS regulations.

Alderman Shea stated I guess I would like to continue the theme but I am kind of in a different venue or thought process. I am wondering how important the "Hands Across the Merrimack" project is in comparison to the needs that we have. In other words in my judgement, if I may, this is a want. We would like to see the "Hands Across the Merrimack" but people can walk across the Granite Street Bridge, etc. so there are ways to come across by walking. I am wondering, Bob, if we as a community want to fulfill the needs that we have why do we allocate money for wants? This is where I find it difficult to approve certain items and I realize there is community involvement here and there is a certain amount of political influence as it were but when we are talking about a fire station that needs to be repaired and other projects can this wait? Is this a necessity?

Mr. MacKenzie responded there has been a group that has been trying to raise the money. Almost half of the project has been raised in Federal and State grants. I think the interest in moving this project ahead now is really two-fold. One is that with all of the construction going on in that area with the stadium and the housing project that it would be much more difficult to reconstruct the bridge and make the approaches once all of that construction is done. So from a construction phasing standpoint this would be the best time to do it. The contractors could work together, the bridge work could be done and you would not disturb, once the residential area is done along the river, you would not disturb that with the new construction because the bridge comes right into the heart of that residential area as proposed – the riverfront housing. The second is that with the closure of Bedford Street there is only one way to get into the new Riverfront Stadium and that is South Commercial Street. Based on the parking studies that we have been from the baseball people, they would estimate that perhaps as much as 1/3 of the parking would be on the West Side. It would be useful to have a second means of egress into this area and as such if we did the bridge in conjunction with these other projects it will provide the best parking layout because people on the West Side could walk in from the bridge into the stadium. There would be two ways of accessing the stadium as opposed to one as it currently stands, which is South Commercial Street. So that was the rationale. With the projects going now – the baseball stadium and the 177 units of housing and the hotel getting the bridge project done would not interfere with the future enjoyment of the housing and stadium and would provide the best parking and access scheme into the stadium when it is completed next spring.

Alderman Shea stated I realize that the baseball season is during the pleasant weather. What happens in the wintertime? Does somebody maintain this bridge or does it take care of itself? It is sort of like we put up items but then the

maintenance...is it going to be a Highway Department project to keep it clean? If someone falls and Harry from Risk Management gets involved...is it usable year round? Is it going to be just used...these are all of the questions. We are putting a lot of money into this and I am wondering how much foresight we are going to have into this situation. I am not really in favor of this right now when we have other needs but could you explain it, Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie responded parts of the Riverwalk have been maintained during the wintertime. There are quite a few people that use it in the winter for jogging and getting down to the river. I would suspect that this particular bridge would be fairly heavily used in the wintertime just for people accessing...West Siders walking to downtown or going to work and by people at the housing project. This bridge may be maintained in the wintertime between the East and West Side.

Alderman Shea asked is it going to be plowed.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked is the Highway Department going to be responsible for that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered normally Parks & Recreation has smaller vehicles to maintain trails.

Alderman Shea asked so Parks & Recreation would be responsible for that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked do those get plowed now, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there are portions of the Riverwalk that have been plowed. Again in this case where the Riverwalk will provide emergency access for the housing project down to Biron Street the Riverwalk is going to have to be maintained to some extent to provide emergency fire access to the South.

Alderman Roy asked Mr. MacKenzie could you explain a little bit about some of the improvements that have been done on the West Side. I know there was some property exchanged and just that this isn't coming to us fresh but there have already been inroads made on the West Side to make this more accessible.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Riverwalk immediately adjacent to the bridge on the West Side is done. It is done roughly from the Highway westerly out to South Main Street. That portion has been improved. There is ADA accessible access to that. There is a new bridge over Second Street. Eventually that trail will continue

westward out into the Piscataquog River Park and eventually the Town of Goffstown has expressed interest in connecting to that so they can get bicyclists into Manchester and into the downtown. Ultimately this entire trail system will connect to the Riverwalk and the Heritage Trail. The Heritage Trail will run north and south all the way to the Massachusetts border up through NH to the Canadian border. This actually will be...the stadium area will be a fairly important junction point of several major East/West and North/South trails in New Hampshire.

Alderman Roy asked have any discussions been made with the residential developer as far as "Hands Across the Merrimack" not only for construction timeframes but costs or possible interest.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I have briefly discussed this issue with the housing developer. He did express some willingness to work with us in terms of the grading. Once you get across the bridge you have to connect down at an ADA accessible slope down to the existing Riverwalk. We have solved some of the engineering problems related to that. I think it would be a good solution and the developer has expressed a willingness to work with us in grading that and making the connection because in essence that connection is going to be on his property at some point if his property is sold to Mr. Chinburg.

Alderman Gatsas stated there was never a conversation about this being a second egress to the baseball park when we closed Bedford Street. I guess the biggest question I have is looking down at the Riverwalk and sometimes I travel the highway in the winter time...Mr. Ludwig can you tell me how many times you have plowed that Riverwalk?

Mr. Ron Ludwig responded never.

Alderman Gatsas asked has anybody plowed that Riverwalk in the winter.

Chairman O'Neil responded I think Highway has.

Alderman Gatsas asked is it done on a snowstorm basis.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard stated when the Riverwalk was built two years ago we had asked for funding. We never received funding for maintenance of that. We have done the best we can. We do plow that when our resources are available.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you tell me in the course of this winter whether it has been plowed.

Mr. Sheppard answered I couldn't tell you quite honestly. I would have to check with my Superintendent. I wouldn't doubt if it has been plowed a couple of times this past winter.

Alderman Gatsas stated well Mr. MacKenzie said there was an awful lot of use by people walking down there in the winter and I don't see how that would happen unless they were doing it in their snow shoes.

Mr. Sheppard responded I think you will find all different types of people down at the Riverwalk whether they are walking through the snow or walking on the pavement.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Chairman, when we go through the CIP budget are we going to be voting on these things individually or as a total package or can we remove some things and vote on them individually.

Chairman O'Neil responded the CIP Committee tries to do the work and present a budget that hopefully will be accepted by the full Board. The full Board always has the ability to amend the recommended budget. It is clear that there are a couple of projects that the Committee has some concerns about moving forward on – "Hands Across the Merrimack" and the library project that I think we need further information on.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to refresh some people's minds if they didn't see the Planning Board meeting when the stadium was presented. They had the bridge already there and they explained everything as far as people walking across and the parking and everything else. It has been mentioned and it has been mentioned quite a few times to a lot of people. It is a project that we have to look at what it is going to bring from the West side to the East side. As somebody said a long time ago and I think my good friend Hank Thibault said it is a way for people to go over to the East Side and a lot of people will probably park around Second Street and places around there and just walk across the bridge to the stadium. It has been mentioned before.

Alderman Gatsas responded with all due respect it was never mentioned that that would be the second egress. That was never talked about as a second egress because we closed Bedford Street. The closure of Bedford Street never came until after the proposal was given. Everybody's mind has to be real clear on that. It was about access, not egress.

Chairman O'Neil stated it sounds like a great topic for the Baseball Committee. One of the things that the departments...Bob you will have to make sure that the departments come back with a breakdown especially on the building projects or

other infrastructure projects. They have to come back with a number for design and a number for construction and it may now be a two-step process where in the past it has been a one-step process. We will have to make sure of that. Let's go to Table 1. Does anyone have any issues on Table 1?

Alderman Shea stated the School District project, they will receive \$10.6 million. Is that correct? Is that a figure that will not change?

Mr. MacKenzie responded it may change a little bit. That is their best current estimate. That includes several different Federal and State grants.

Alderman Shea asked but each year is that pretty constant.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it fluctuates some - \$1 or \$2 million.

Alderman Shea responded \$1 or \$2 million is quite a bit. Does it go up or down?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it could go 10% above or 10% below. This is their current best estimate. It is primarily Title I funds, Special Education funds.

- h) communication from the Director of Planning regarding a Southern NH Housing Services request of \$250,000; and

Chairman O'Neil asked, Mr. MacKenzie, have you had a chance to look at this and do you have a recommendation tonight or will you make a recommendation in the future on that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could just clarify for the Committee we structured many of these HUD grants for housing this year to be roughly ½ grant and ½ loan. In the past many of these have been grants but we have been trying to get program income back for other housing projects. All of the housing projects in the CIP are a grant/loan combination. On Hanover Street, Southern NH Services has indicated that the grant program they are going for they cannot have a loan as part of that so they are asking for the full amount to be a grant. I believe that we would like to make sure that they have exhausted all funding sources with HUD. There may be an ability to go back to HUD to release additional funds. For now I think we should leave the funding amount as it is and see if HUD will come through with the money at which time the Board could then reallocate funds.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct to say this isn't critical that we have to resolve this before we approve the CIP budget.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is not critical. The amount is not in contention it is whether it is a loan or a grant.

Alderman Shea stated there is a Wellness Grant for the Fire Department.

Chairman O'Neil asked is it in City Cash.

Alderman Shea answered not it is in Table 1. It is a matching grant. I am just wondering whether they are going to have a physical...it is \$150,000 that they are asking for under City Cash so this is \$300,000.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes actually is a larger grant than that and the if the Chief is here I know he has all of the details on that. I thought he said it was in total a \$500,000 grant.

Alderman Shea asked for a wellness program.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked and that is for one year. We will have the most physically fit firefighters in the world for \$500,000 won't we?

Chairman O'Neil asked, Chief Kane, is this something that may be appropriate for...it could be a little bit of a presentation and I don't know that we want to...can you summarize it pretty quick.

Chief Kane stated actually that might be a good idea to have us come back with a little bit of a presentation with regards to this. It is a very comprehensive program. I know what it says in here it sounds like weight equipment but it is a much more comprehensive program than that. It is not a match. It is not a 50/50 match. It is a 30/70 match. We are talking...the dollar figure is \$500,000 and really what this does is it is not a one year program. This is something that we hope will reach out into the future. In talking to the Chairman earlier I understand that there are some concerns in regards to the cost. We have actually been able to take a look at this and we probably will be able to get that figure down substantially. What we would like to do is work on that and maybe come back at the next meeting and make a presentation. Certainly we want to make sure that our pencils are as sharp as we possibly can on this. I know that it is a cash project and cash is tight. We certainly want to work with the Committee in regards to that figure. I would like to emphasize that it is our number one priority in our department. There are a lot of things attached to it. I really see long-term savings for the City but also realizing that it is a lot of money. We are going to relook at that and see if we can get that cash down substantially and come back to the Committee with that.

Alderman Shea asked according to our records, \$150,000 is listed as Federal, State or Other funds and then under City Cash \$150,000 so that is \$300,000. What you have indicated is that you are going to come back to the Committee and say look we probably can pare this down to a reasonable amount so that we don't ask for \$150,000 from the City as far as City Cash?

Chief Kane answered that is correct. Your interpretation of that...I know it is in two spots in your budget – under cash and under grant but the grant is actually for almost \$400,000 coming from the Federal government. \$392,000 actually.

Alderman Shea asked so you will come back...

Chief Kane interjected why don't we come back with a more substantial presentation.

Alderman Garrity asked is this something that is in the firefighter's contract.

Chief Kane answered yes it is part of the firefighter's contract.

Alderman Garrity asked so is it something that we can reduce because it is in that contract without renegotiating the contract.

Chief Kane answered I think we are going to take a different look at it. I think we can reduce it. We are going to look at it in a different way. I think the program is the program. It is a standardized program. It is not something we developed. We can't reduce the program but we can hopefully reduce the cash out of CIP.

Alderman Garrity asked is this something the Alderman can say no we are not going to do it this year we will do it next year or are we binded by contract.

Chief Kane answered we are binded by contract to implement the program July 1.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure that I understand you. How soon can you get back to us because that \$150,000 Cash there are some other programs here that we have to make a decision on?

Chief Kane responded I can get back to you as quickly as you would like. I am not sure when the next CIP meeting is.

Alderman Lopez asked can you notify the Chairman as soon as possible the amount of cash and if you are going to take it out of the FY04 budget and that releases \$150,000 that we need.

Chief Kane interjected I am not saying \$150,000. I said substantial but there has to be some sort of commitment here.

Alderman Lopez asked \$100,000.

Chief Kane answered I can probably get it down to under \$100,000. What I will do is I will communicate that number to the Chair, along with additional program notes to the rest of the Committee before the end of the week.

Alderman Lopez asked just to make sure this is your number one priority not a vehicle correct.

Chief Kane answered correct.

Alderman Shea stated when one discusses programs we can use a generic term or we can use a specific term. In the contractual agreement is there anything specific or is there a generic term that you will have a wellness program, which is a general term that can range from...and is that what is in the contract or is there a specific breakdown in terms of a specific project, program or what have you?

Chief Kane responded in the contract there is a specific term. There is a wellness program that was initiated by the International Firefighter's Association, along with the International Fire Chief's Association and that is the program that has been identified in the contract.

Alderman Shea asked so that is in the contractual agreement as of the last contract.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked so that is a negotiable item. That is to say that it can be negotiated continuously or it can be negotiated in terms of something else?

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked are you saying that we negotiated a contract two years ago and put this in as an item for three years forward.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.



Alderman Gatsas asked can you give us...when you send your report can you tell us exactly by definition what the spell out is of the Wellness Program. Is there a document?

Chief Kane answered there is a lengthy book.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you provide us with that.

Chief Kane answered it is a very substantial book and I would have to order that from Washington. I do have a couple of copies around that I will provide to the Chairman.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have it in a form where it can be physically copied at a copy center or do you only have it in book form.

Chief Kane answered we probably can get it copied at a copy center.

Chairman O'Neil stated I am sure the Clerk's Office will assist you in those efforts.

Chief Kane stated we do have a synopsis here of what the Wellness Program is with us tonight that we could handout.

Alderman Gatsas responded I am not looking for they have to do 15 push ups or 20 sit ups because if I start looking at the numbers if memory serves me correctly you have about 250 people at the department. That number when you start multiplying it looks like it is over \$2,500 a person on a yearly basis for a wellness program. That is almost to the extent of what health care coverage is for a single employee.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have a summary either tonight or that you can get to us at some point.

Chief Kane answered I have a summary right here that I can hand out. This is not a cost on a yearly basis. This grant and the cost of the wellness program is to basically get the thing up and running and moving along on an annual basis. It is not going to cost that kind of money.

Chairman O'Neil stated part of the intent here is to cut down on workman's compensation related injuries as well as general health problems.

Chief Kane responded yes. We have had a number of reports and there have been a number of organizations that have come into the Fire Department and one of

their main things that they put in the reports is that we establish this wellness program. Again, so you understand this is not an annual cost. It is a start-up cost to get the program up and running.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you just give me an idea of what this wellness program is all about. What is the \$600,000 for? There has to be some general equipment or instructors or whatever.

Chief Kane answered it is all of that. It is nutritional courses. It is courses for peer fitness trainers. It is equipment. We certainly can break all of that down for you. It is a combination of all of those things. It is a very comprehensive program.

Chairman O'Neil asked Chief am I correct and I think you and I had this discussion at one point that some of this cost. I just happened to note the medical examinations. That is something that we are already paying for that the grant will pick up now correct?

Chief Kane answered that is one of the issues that we have to look at.

Chairman O'Neil stated but we already have to pay for every firefighter to get a physical examination.

Chief Kane responded that is correct. That is part of the program. In the Fire Department we have...the firefighters are qualified as Haz-Mat technicians and underneath the Federal regulations they are required to have annual physicals.

Alderman Shea asked just to go through the costs, it says annual medical examinations \$138,160. I mean every firefighter is going to be subjected to a medical exam.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated they get those now.

Chief Kane stated all of the numbers in all of the programs, even the ones they go through right now are on that sheet.

Alderman Shea asked so the \$138,160, every firefighter and every employee from the Fire Department gets a medical exam every year.

Chief Kane answered just firefighters.

Alderman Shea asked just firefighters.

Chief Kane answered well sworn officers.

Alderman Shea stated then there is fitness, nutrition, behavioral health and counseling. That is \$24,000. That is a special person that you hire that comes in?

Chief Kane responded yes and that is a one time cost.

Alderman Shea stated you have immunizations at \$33,000. They are now immunized once a year. Is that flu shots and stuff like that or special kinds of immunizations?

Chief Kane responded that is something that we do for Hepatitis B and that is something we do now.

Alderman Shea asked fitness equipment of \$273,000 is that going to be dispersed to different fire stations.

Chief Kane answered that is correct. Each fire station will have some equipment.

Alderman Shea asked and construction costs – electrical and ventilation, that is that.

Chief Kane answered as the equipment gets installed, if it is a piece of electrical equipment they may need a plug to plug it in so we tried to build all of those things into the program because we are looking for Federal funding for that.

Alderman Shea asked and periodic health screenings. First they are going to get an exam and then they are going to get immunized and then they are going to get screenings? \$87,500. Is this part of...

Chief Kane interjected that is basically part of what we do now on an annual basis.

Alderman Shea asked so that is a total of \$561,375 and this is a one-year grant or is this going to happen every year.

Chief Kane answered it is a one-year grant. Most of those costs are one-year costs. They are not annual costs. Once we get the program up and running, the costs return to normal.

Alderman Shea stated I know that you are involved with Homeland Security. Is this tapping into that kind of situation at all?

Chief Kane responded no it is a different grant. It is called a Fire Act Grant. It is coming from a...it is not the same as the Homeland Security grant.

Chairman O'Neil asked Chief Kane some of these costs will be annually. Medical examinations are going to be an annual cost. They have been an annual cost it is just that the grant is picking it up this year but it generally comes out of your operating budget.

Chief Kane answered it would come out of the Human Resources operating budget.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we are really saving some money by the grant picking it up this year.

Chief Kane answered hopefully we are going to be able to save some money by doing some of that.

Chairman O'Neil asked regarding shots, is that annual. Does that go on now?

Chief Kane answered yes. Once you get your shot and it is a series of three shots, then you are set and good to go.

Chairman O'Neil asked so that really is a one time cost. On the periodic health screenings is that an annual cost? Has that been going on and will that go on after the first year of the grant?

Chief Kane answered yes. That is basically the annual health screening grant.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the difference between medical examination and health screening.

Chief Kane answered the medical examination is a base examination that is done – a complete examination that is done one time to set your baseline. After that, you get an annual health screening.

Alderman Shea asked wouldn't it make sense if we could get a breakdown as far as what is going to be beneficial to the City in terms of this. In other words if the City would provide you with \$150,000 but on the other hand on the general budget you are going to save \$300,000 that would make a lot of sense. How can we break that down? Is there some way that could be broken down so that as a Committee we can see the rationale behind this?

Chief Kane answered sure we could supply that to you.

Chairman O'Neil asked this did come out of an issue where you had a death in the line of duty that kind of forced some of this right.

Chief Kane answered that is correct. There has been a long history here. This is not something that just came off the...it has been discussed over the years and then we had the death of Mr. Andersen. As a result of that, we had OSHA come in and do a study of the department. OSHA submitted a report to the City in regards to our operations and one of the deficiencies in that report was the fact that we didn't have a wellness program in place.

Alderman DeVries stated the CIP budget shows \$150,000 in grant money and \$150,000 in City cash. I am wondering which of the two numbers is incorrect. The Chief is telling us that this is a 70/30 on the grant and clearly we have it as a 50/50.

Mr. Samuel Maranto stated I will have to check the grant proposal.

Alderman DeVries asked so you will check the grant proposal at your office to increase the Federal dollars.

Mr. Maranto answered yes I have already noted that.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the correct number.

Alderman DeVries answered I think the Chief said it was about \$500,000 in total.

Chief Kane stated the answer would be \$392,000 in Table 1.

Mr. Maranto responded that would also depend on whether we fund the program fully. If you put \$392,000, we need to put the total amount from the City under cash.

Chairman O'Neil stated you lost me on this. What is the number that belongs in Table 1 and what is the number that belongs in cash?

Alderman DeVries stated if I could what Sam is stating is he is hearing some hesitancy on this Committee's part as to whether they wish to fully fund the available grant monies, which are up to \$500,000 or something like that. So \$392,000 is the total Federal and whatever the 30% City cash is, which I think is \$170,000 on the City side which gets us the full grant. I guess I have a couple of comments because certainly this is not a new issue. For many years the Fire

Department has struggled to prevent some of the injuries because wellness was always handled through volunteer make shift exercise equipment. There was no consistency and there was no quality control and firefighters did get injured and it cost the City money for years. There were also many firefighters when they went through the first Haz-Mat physical who were found to have some issues that needed to be addressed. So the Fire Department has been working towards this end for well over a decade to come up with a wellness proposal that was palatable both to the force and the administration. It is a cost that I think the City is going to be absorbing whether we allow the use of some Federal monies to offset that cost for the exercise equipment to be installed and for the program to be initiated or not. If we do not do that I think we will be revisiting this with City cash over time in the future. It is not going to go away. The need is there and it is always going to be there.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have asked the Chief to come back with some information and breakdowns. Is there something you need to know about this program tonight?

Alderman Gatsas asked if I understand you correctly if I subtract \$150,000 from your general budget you will still have the \$150,000 from CIP to do this project. That is the simple way of saying it because we are already paying for medical exams. You can't pay for them twice.

Chief Kane answered that is correct but they wouldn't be in our budget. They never have been in our budget. They would be in the HR budget and that is one of the issues that I really need to visit.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we can subtract \$150,000.

Chairman O'Neil answered not from his budget though.

Chief Kane stated it is from HR.

Chairman O'Neil stated let's have them get together and figure this out.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have a problem when I look at this number. That is \$200 a month. I can send you to the best health club in the United States for \$200 a month.

Chief Kane responded the way we approach this is when we look at this and we looked at the opportunity to get a Federal grant to come in and pick up most of the cost of the program we thought that having the grant come into the City would be beneficial to the City. We have the opportunity to do that and to have the Federal

government come in and pay for most of the program or if we don't want to do that and we would like to do something else then the City is going to have to at some point in time over the course of years pick up the cost of running the program. So the way I look at this is that it is an opportunity to get almost \$400,000 in Federal money into the City if that is what the Board will approve.

Chairman O'Neil stated just for clarification this is not a program you invented. This was a program put together a year or a number of years ago in a joint effort by the International Association of Fire Chiefs and the International Association of Firefighters. There was a lot of research done. This is a standardized program being used across the country it is my understanding.

Chief Kane responded that is correct. This program is being used everywhere across the country from California to Florida to New England. It is a standardized program across the country and something that...we are going to be marching down this road one way or the other. This gives us an opportunity to get some Federal money in here to pick up the substantial part of the cost at the beginning.

Alderman Shea stated in any program there is a certain outcome so when you prepare your report we would like to see what the outcome is going to be. In other words, what do we anticipate in the form of benefits from this program? Not just the program but in FY05 if we look at this program if we were to approve it what are we going to say. What is going to be the result? Are 10 firefighters going to be less apt to be injured? Are there going to be some sort of other...do you get what I am saying? Not just what we are doing but what is going to happen as a result of this program so that maybe down the road the Police Department may want to have a wellness program and the Highway Department. What I am trying to indicate is every program should have a positive result as the result of all of this preparation on your part and that is what I am looking for. Different competition among the different fire stations and so forth so that we are going to have a very healthy group of men and women who will be able to perform their duties responsibly without cutting back on overtime and sickness and things of that nature.

Chief Kane replied one of the big targets here obviously is illness and worker's compensation. That is obviously what we need to look at – the reduction of worker's compensation claims and injury claims and those types of things. That is the goal. The goal is that we can reduce medical costs to the City of Manchester through this type of program.

Chairman O'Neil stated some of it is going to be assumptions for a year or two until you get some history behind you.

Chief Kane responded yes. There is nothing that I am going to be able to lay out here right now.

Alderman Roy stated if I could just bring a little bit of closure to this, if Sam can confirm the 70/30 the Federal funds would be \$293,000 and the City side would be \$167,000 for the full budget to be accomplished according to the Fire Department handout. Of that handout, \$280,000 are costs for equipment and renovations. \$273,000 in just fitness equipment. That is not an annual expense. That is something that will be in all of our fire stations individually so that not only can the men and women in uniform train in their home station but they can also provide us with the response times that our residents have become accustomed to. If we did reduce the amount to \$500,000 the City side would be \$150,000, which is already in the budget and the Federal side would be \$350,000. So the only number that needs to be changed is on Table 1, that \$150,000 should go to \$350,000 for a \$500,000 commitment towards this program. If the Chief could outline where any potential budget savings are in the Fire Department or HR that we could chip away at that \$150,000 that would be fantastic.

Chairman O'Neil stated I just want to run quickly through the communications we received.

- a) communication from Alderman Roy;

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Roy has a request about some intersection improvements. The first step in recommending it may be the need to...according to the Deputy Director of Public Works there has been a number of traffic studies related to private development but the City has never really done a traffic study up there to see what is going on to justify those numbers. So that may be a recommendation and something we will have to look at to see if we can fit in.

- b) communication from Alderman Smith;

Chairman O'Neil stated the Public Works Director handed out tonight an agreement that a new sidewalk blower should be included and the two snowblower attachments there will be a request for a transfer within your FY04 budget correct.

Mr. Sheppard answered we are currently taking a look at our budget and that may be a recommendation.

Chairman O'Neil asked and that is about \$12,000 or \$12,400.

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

- c) communication from Alderman Forest;



Chairman O'Neil stated this communication is asking for consideration for the Piscataquog River West Junior Deb. That is in the Mayor's recommended.

d) communication from Alderman Lopez;

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Lopez has a couple of items. We brought up the discussion regarding the Library and that we needed a presentation on that . The chronic drain...Alderman Lopez I am not sure what you are recommending. I think it is \$25,000 isn't it? The way I read your note was cut it from \$50,000 to \$25,000.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure that on Item 6 of our agenda it said I request your approval to complete the work of the following projects – the \$32,500 are we saying we need the \$32,500 in addition or does that take all of your funds.

Mr. Sheppard responded I believe we will have \$5,500 for the rest of this year.

Alderman Lopez stated in talking to Frank Thomas if anything else came up...in other words we cut you from \$50,000 to \$25,000 and you have these projects here to do. I think that is what I was looking at. Is there a way to add another \$25,000 to the chronic drain program for the FY05 budget. That would give them the balance of that money to do other projects on the horizon that they won't otherwise be able to do.

Chairman O'Neil asked can Highway work with Planning on that and come up with a recommendation.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes we will try to help with that.

Chairman O'Neil asked Alderman Lopez what about the Bright Ideas Program.

Alderman Lopez stated that is why it was so important on that \$150,000 up above. It would make a great difference and as soon as the Chief gets back to you we will be able to solve it. The \$19,000...for the last four years we have had employee training but I found out today and Bob I think you can maybe clarify this but the ADA compliance account 810405 – we can't transfer that money because it is CDBG money is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes. I know that we spoke about that earlier and that cannot be used for the other program. So no that cannot be transferred.

Alderman Lopez stated without having an additional \$19,000 to put into the budget for HR and the Director is here tonight so she can explain it better than I but we sort of sanctioned as the Board the training program and the newsletter and the Bright Ideas Program for the employees and we are going to be hurting there.

Chairman O'Neil asked so your recommendation is that we need to add \$19,000 to HR and \$25,000 to the chronic drain. Let's go down to item d.

Alderman Lopez stated this is an item that is not in the HR budget. It can probably be referred to the Finance Committee because it is not really a CIP issue because it goes into the operating budget 0350 management services. This is for the consultant, Jack Sherry who has been helping the City with health insurance.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin do you concur that that belongs in the operating budget.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

- e) communication from the Public Works Director regarding concrete curb replacement;

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman DeVries has brought up an issue that affects several wards around the City regarding concrete curb replacement. I think we need to answer some questions ourselves at some point. Not tonight. I know that one Alderman said to me what about the people that don't have any curbing but on the other hand the City did accept this curbing as part of the right-of-way.

Alderman DeVries stated certainly to address the first comment that was made about somebody without any curbing, they would be eligible under the City's 50/50 program to install the granite curb. Unfortunately and I think that Kevin Sheppard can come up and probably address this more eloquently but if you have concrete curb that is deteriorated in front of your house they cannot cut the curb to remove it to replace that broken down concrete with granite. So until the City decides to start funding the CIP request, which is in there every year and you will notice on the second page of the Highway Department CIP request they have an allocation for \$150,000 every year past and this shows from 2005 to 2010. The City as we have done with many of our projects chose not to fund proper infrastructure. I think you should take a look at the list that was provided and this is not meant to be a complete list of the streets with concrete curbing but you can see this is throughout the City. It is not a South end problem. There are many in

Ward 2, 1, 12, 6 and 8. You can drive around and take a look at the different roads and see where...especially where there are hills and there is a heavier South application, the concrete curbing breaks down. You then get the rebar that will be sticking up and can cause dangerous situations. It just goes on and on and it needs to be addressed. If we do not address it on an annual basis we will be bonding for this. This is the same as repaving our roads. It is infrastructure that needs to be addressed.

Chairman O'Neil asked is it our responsibility because we have accepted...Bob or Kevin do you know if this is our responsibility because we have accepted the right-of-way.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. Once completed by the developer and a number of these streets were done in the 1980's it becomes the City's responsibility.

Chairman O'Neil asked we are not approving this...the Planning Board is not approving these concrete curbs anymore I hope.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no. Both the Planning staff and the Highway Department really in the 1990's felt that they should shift to granite curbing despite some concern by developers but our experience had been so poor with concrete curbing that we did change over to that in the early 1990's.

Alderman DeVries stated I did want to ask somebody from the Highway Department and I realize you are put on the spot here and you are probably not ready to make a full presentation but if somebody calls your office today asking you to address the broken down concrete curb in front of their house what is the answer that they are given.

Mr. Sheppard responded it is based on priority and other needs.

Alderman DeVries asked and do you offer them availability through the 50/50 program.

Mr. Sheppard answered some concrete curbing can actually be replaced with the 50/50 Program. I know some residents have done that. The old concrete has been pulled and the granite put in.

Alderman DeVries asked how do you make that determination because I have had several homeowners tell me that they have been told that they cannot cut it and I have heard that from your department as well.

Mr. Sheppard responded I want to talk to you about that a little more because I would like to verify that.

Alderman Shea stated right now Kevin if a person wants to have a granite curbing there is a 50/50 program. Is that correct?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Alderman Shea asked so there are other parts of the City where they have concrete curbing and the problem with that is that again the people who have paid to have granite curbing are going to turn around and say now wait a minute here. If I knew that my curbing was going to be replaced and the City was going to go into this situation why am I paying when obviously I could have gotten it if the City were to have that program. The estimate of this...I don't know if all of these requests were granted but would it roughly be a couple of million or a couple of hundred thousand.

Mr. Sheppard responded I was just trying to figure that out. We have \$150,000 in the budget and that would allow for installation of 4,165 linear feet. So I believe to do the whole 156,000 feet it would be about \$500,000.

Alderman Roy stated if we do the total 156,000 feet it is \$5,616,000.

Alderman Shea asked how much would it be.

Alderman Roy answered if you did the whole 156,000 feet it is \$5,616,000 to do the streets listed.

Alderman Shea stated and we can't even find the money to do a wellness program.

Mr. Sheppard stated it is a program that we identified as part of our CIP.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would have to say that I don't disagree with Alderman DeVries. I have taken calls from Ward 6 on this. I try to encourage the people to participate in the 50/50 program. I think that is one of our more successful programs. We can add money to it. Generally am I correct that we get maxed out fairly early? It is on a first come first serve basis and whoever gets their check in gets done. I don't disagree that that issue is there. The business I am at was built in the 1980's and has concrete curb. I am wondering if we can help address this somehow through maybe a little more money with the 50/50 and put it as both an issue for the homeowner as well as the City and kind of be partners in trying to solve this thing. I don't know how you determine who gets it.

Alderman DeVries stated I have had a discussion and obviously it wasn't with Kevin but I have talked with Bruce Thomas and Frank Thomas and they both agree that this is not an issue that you can deal with through the 50/50 program and they do not wish to start cutting into individual streets and one small segment when the rest of the street has deteriorated concrete curb. What I asked them to do was to take their own look at priorities. I don't think this should be politically driven. I think the Highway Department should be identifying the most deteriorated and dangerous concrete curbs and replacing them. It doesn't matter what ward it is in. I think it should be a worse come worse serve process. They know and they can certainly do that. Now we can do it that way or we can do it the way that we do our street repaving when every ward gets a certain allocation to address a portion of a street or whatever the funding allows us. Not every street needs to be replaced today. Some clearly are worse because if there is a hill and they have had heavier salting there is not much left to the curbing. If you go down some of the roads you will see where there will be 30 feet without curbing and then it will pick up again.

Alderman Lopez stated we should have Highway put a plan together.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think there is an interest in trying to help out here it is just how do we do it and at what cost. That is the issue.

Alderman DeVries responded I think my point was that to ignore it for another year is just...something needs to be funded for this program so that we can begin to address this. It is not going away.

Chairman O'Neil stated predominantly it looks like there are about four wards that are affected by this. I don't think there is a disagreement I think we need to figure out how we get there. Kevin, can you come up with a plan and maybe Mr. MacKenzie has some thoughts on how to address it.

Alderman Lopez stated we forgot one of my other items – 411205 \$20,000 to the Police Department for a City lot. I had some discussion with Police on that and I think CIP ought to take a good look at that because they have been very successful in doing that.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is it.

Alderman Lopez answered it is for the vehicles that are involved in serious crimes and I will let them speak about it. They have to impound the car. The point I want to make is there are procedures they are using today and now they want to spend \$20,000 on another lot.

Deputy Police Chief Simmons stated the lot we are looking for is for cars that have been impounded for serious motor vehicle accidents that have evidentiary value, vehicles that have been stolen that we need to process and occasional vehicles that are involved in homicides that we keep for several years. What we do currently is we have contracts with several wrecker companies. Part of the contract requires that they have a lot to house several of those vehicles. During the course of time, some of those vehicles get vandalized. People may break into the lot and take something out of the vehicles. The problem we have with that is that could taint the evidentiary value of the vehicle later on when the case goes to court. We looked at it and said if there was some land available in the City and we could get some CIP funds we could utilize those funds to secure our own lot and keep better contact with the vehicles that we have impounded for evidentiary purposes and take that away from the wrecker companies all together.

Alderman Lopez stated I also talked to you in reference to the Police Athletic League and they have garages over there and a parking lot where you could possibly work out an arrangement over there.

Deputy Chief Simmons responded I guess we would have to sit with the Police Athletic League on that.

Alderman Roy asked is this a lot that you already have under contract or where would this lot be coming from. Is it surplus land?

Deputy Chief Simmons responded we were thinking of a parcel of City land someplace rather than purchasing it. As I indicated right now these tow companies that we contract with all have a parcel of land that has to be secured and fenced in and we are utilizing those for our storage facilities.

Alderman Roy asked so you wouldn't be shopping in the private market for a piece of land for \$20,000.

Deputy Chief Simmons answered no.

Alderman Shea stated you have indicated that right now where you are storing these vehicles security is not up to where it should be right.

Deputy Chief Simmons responded right now under contract they have to keep that lot secure, which they do, but occasionally somebody will get into those lots and get into those vehicles and take things out. We haven't run into a problem with that as far as a court case goes but we are always concerned that it could happen some day. For the most part, those lots are secure but we felt this would be a better situation.

Alderman Shea asked if you were to get another lot what would...

Deputy Chief Simmons interjected we would secure it the way we would want it secured. We would probably sit with Mr. Robidas to discuss options of having cameras visible so we could monitor it at the station as well.

Alderman Shea asked are there provisions now where you could upgrade the type of security you have in the lots.

Deputy Chief Simmons answered I don't think we could do anything with cameras because they are all privately owned companies. Those contracts are renewable each year and some of the companies stay and some don't.

Alderman Shea asked in other words what you are saying is these privately owned companies that own these lots wouldn't agree to have additional security. Wouldn't it help them too because obviously they must be having some problems?

Deputy Chief Simmons answered it is certainly an option we can look at for the next contract.

Alderman Gatsas stated I haven't brought his request to you because I just heard about it. I was approached by a crossing guard on the corner of Pickering and Webster Street. There are kids going across there and he feels that there is a good likelihood that there could be a problem. Cars come over the Webster Street hill and they are going very fast.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin didn't we at one time have a school sidewalk program.

Mr. Sheppard answered we still do.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that something this could possibly fit into.

Mr. Sheppard answered we could take a look at that. It is based on proximity to the school.

Alderman Gatsas stated it is about a block away.

Mr. Sheppard responded we could take a look at that and see if there is a need for a sidewalk or a crosswalk or something else.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe there is already a crosswalk going across Webster Street and a blinking light.

Chairman O'Neil stated maybe Deputy Simmons could ask his people to do a little more traffic enforcement over there.

Alderman Shea stated I did have a problem similar to the one on Webster Street over on Cilley Road because of the high curve there. I think there probably should be some help given in terms of the traffic...in other words trying to resolve that problem because as one goes either east or west they are going over a large hump there, which obviously is a danger so it is sort of like a highway problem relating to obviously a sidewalk problem but I am just saying that even if you were to put sidewalks there it still would present a problem because there is a large hill there that you have to kind of mount when you are going up and I think the visibility is extremely poor, particularly eastbound. There is a problem there I know because I travel over there a lot.

- g) communication from the Deputy Director of Parks,  
Recreation & Cemetery regarding the Crystal Lake Park –  
Master Plan;

Chairman O'Neil stated the only other communication we have here is from Ron Johnson regarding the Crystal Lake Master Plan. We seem to have three different park Master Plans in the CIP. We just did \$17,000 for some type of Master Plan at Stark Park...\$12,000 actually. We got a request for \$25,000 for Crystal Lake and we have \$45,000 in the budget for a general Master Plan under CDBG. What I really think would be wonderful as someone who doesn't have any requests in here is to identify and do a needs assessment or a conditions assessment similar to what we did with our school buildings when we had the Parsons Brinckerhoff study. It gave us a great document to work with. The Highway Department has a similar plan that they use for the chronic sewer and CSO and sewage in the City. They follow a plan and they say this is what we are going to do this year and next year we are going to do that and with our Park system we seem to keep doing these pockets all over the place and I am not sure we ever really accomplish anything at the end. I, for one, could support spending a significant amount of money to do a Master Plan of the City. What are the needs currently? We have the Park Recovery Plan. It is 12 years old. Things have changed. The needs of the youth and in some cases the adults has changed in that time period. There are some new design technologies out there that maybe could be incorporated. The other thing is we could get a priority list and say this park is by far, based on the needs, the worst park and you really should attack that first. I don't think \$45,000 is going to do it. I don't think adding \$25,000 to the \$45,000 is going to do it or adding the \$12,000 is going to do it. I would really like to see us come up with a



number, reach out to some consultants to try to figure out what it is and get a comprehensive plan. We have the City Master Plan to work with and that 12-year-old document is a good start but we really in my opinion it would be the best money we could spend regarding our parks. We react a lot to our needs in the parks instead of having a real good plan to work with. Again, this has nothing to do with the department. They do the best with the resources they have but we put a heavy demand on our park system and I would really like to see us, before we approve these Master Plans...well we have already approved Stark Park to try to address that issue but before we approve Crystal Lake and spending the \$45,000 for what may not be a comprehensive Master Plan that we give some consideration to what the cost would be. I think it would be a great tool for us to work with.

Alderman Shea stated I know, Bob, that you are going to have \$50,000 supposedly for a Master Plan. Am I correct?

Mr. MacKenzie responded there is \$50,000 proposed for a community-wide Master Plan of which one chapter would be on parks.

Alderman Shea stated what I am trying to say is would the need...in other words can you fulfill the need that they have in order to have a comprehensive plan as the Alderman to my left has so outlined.

Mr. MacKenzie responded not out of that because that is just one of about 12 chapters that will go into the community plan. The last time around when the Master Plan was done they relied on that Recovery Action Plan to give the prioritized listing and to identify how many soccer fields the City needed and track, etc. I think the level that Alderman O'Neil is talking about is needed. I am still not sure we need a lot more than \$45,000 to do that. That is really a needs assessment of the parks and priority listing of which parks should be rehabbed first.

Alderman Shea asked would it help if Ron Johnson sat down with you and had a discussion and then came back and said look it...I am just ballparking this but if \$70,000 were given for a Master Plan to include parks it would be comprehensive and there would be mutual work between the two rather than as Alderman O'Neil has indicated it is sort of like getting things arbitrarily rather than going to get a...

Mr. MacKenzie interjected I would be happy to sit down with him and since we are doing a community Master Plan we should be dovetailing these two together.

Alderman DeVries stated I would like to ask Ron Johnson if he would come up and address the particular components of a Master Plan when we are trying to

initiate a park project. This is a project that we already attempted with one round of grants and did not receive the money for playground equipment.

Mr. Ron Johnson stated I would like to just clarify something. We are using the term Master Plan and I guess there are two different realms. As Mr. MacKenzie said the Recovery Action Plan was a Master Plan that looked at the whole City. That was done one year before the current Master Plan was adopted. The City's Master Plan was done in 1993 and the Recovery Action Plan was done right before that. The two additional projects that we are requesting are for site specific plans. Once you do a comprehensive Master Plan you are looking at the overall City and where do we need certain fields and what are the current trends as Alderman O'Neil mentioned but for Stark Park we are actually looking at that specific site. We are going to meet with the neighbors and identify what the problems and issues are – where do we need lighting, where do we need better access. So it gets down to the site level. The same thing is proposed for Crystal Lake. Maybe we would expand that a little bit just beyond the lake itself but it would be a facility Master Plan. We again would look at the needs in that area. That is the only recreational facility in Southeast Manchester. When the Master Plan was done in 1993 and adopted by the City it identified that Southeast Manchester needed not only a community sized park of 50 acres approximately but also a neighborhood park. That is where all of the residential growth has happened and we don't have the facilities there. I think the \$45,000 that is being identified for the overall City Master Plan, I think we can take that same approach and work with Planning and get that in anticipation of them adopting a Master Plan but when you get to Stark Park these are going to be kind of that first step that you mentioned earlier this evening of doing a plan and trying to get some engineering costs before we get into the big project and seeing what the construction will entail.

Chairman O'Neil stated we know we are reacting at Stark Park to some very significant issues to the neighbors but by adopting this Master Plan at Crystal Lake and I am not suggesting that we don't need to go forward on Crystal Lake but I am saying how does that fit in to the rest of what we need to do in the City. Again it is an issue and I forget the term Alderman Shea used earlier but it is not a hodge podge but we are going here and we are going there and I just see that as a continuation of it. What would it hurt to include Crystal Lake in a Citywide park and recreation facility Master Plan?

Mr. Johnson responded well Crystal Lake is identified in that current Recovery Action Plan.

Chairman O'Neil replied but the document is 12 years old. It is not up-to-date. That is my whole point.

Mr. Johnson stated but every year when we do our CIP I go back to the Recovery Action Plan, look at the projects that have been done and have not been done. At Crystal Lake, if we go back to that one, the need for a playground was identified and there still is no playground there. We also identified the need to improve the bathhouse.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we need to spend \$25,000 to identify that stuff.

Mr. Johnson answered no. I think at the meeting with Alderman DeVries and the Crystal Lake Preservation Association they want to expand that study out beyond just the park itself. Additional open space has been purchased in that watershed through new residential development. There are other parcels that they are looking at through the I-93 mitigation so I think they want to put together a plan that would look at that overall watershed where Crystal Lake would be the center of the open space.

Chairman O'Neil stated but you haven't sold me on why that doesn't fit into an overall plan. Why can't that exact work be done as part of a bigger project?

Mr. Johnson responded in that overall plan you are not going to get down to this site specific level. The overall plan is going to look at...

Chairman O'Neil interjected well I hope they are going to get to site...they are not going to do site specific drawings but hopefully they are going to come back with a recommendation on every site.

Mr. Johnson replied they will go through and say where do we need additional ball fields, where do we need to include additional open space but getting down to the detail level of where the actual playground is going and what other land we need to purchase in that immediate area that would be a site specific plan.

Alderman Lopez stated Crystal Lake when I was a Parks & Recreation Commissioner was in the books there. The \$25,000 maybe is high but how much do you think you need to do what you want to do for Crystal Lake?

Mr. Johnson asked are you referring to the planning aspects.

Alderman Lopez answered yes.

Mr. Johnson stated I think what we have identified is this would also allow us to do some survey work and get some engineering surveys done. It wouldn't be just Crystal Lake Park that is about 20 acres. We would also look at the other parcels

that are now coming on line through open space, the I-93 mitigation and the property that has been identified there. I think what the Committee wants to do out in that section of the City is try to link some of those together.

Alderman Lopez asked can you give us a number.

Mr. Johnson answered I think we have identified the \$25,000 because we are going to have to also get into some appraisal work in looking at certain parcels.

Alderman Lopez stated I think there is some area where we can find some money for this. It depends a lot on the wellness program for the Fire Department. I think we can move forward on this.

Alderman Shea stated I second that.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't disagree that Crystal Lake...we are continuing what we said is a problem in this City that we are taking these individual...and at the end we don't end up solving anything. That is my whole argument with this.

Alderman Shea replied I think part of the problem, Mr. Chairman, is that they sort of work together with an association. Is that correct?

Mr. Johnson stated yes. The Crystal Lake Preservation Association originally started focusing on the park but now they are looking at the overall watershed of the lake through some residential development that occurred just off of Mammoth Road. They were able to obtain a parcel of property that abuts Crystal Lake and now they are working with the NH DOT on the I-93 mitigation. I think that we can grow in that community partnership.

Alderman Shea stated I think, Mr. Chairman, is what we indicated is that you are going to get together with Bob concerning the...I guess we set aside \$50,000 for your Master Plan and \$45,000 for the other one and if we could kind of use that \$25,000 to get this started...in fairness to the people in the South end they just don't have anything. We put money into Livingston and into the bath area there. We put money into Prout Park and Derryfield. We are putting money into the West Side and other areas and obviously in comparison this is a very small amount. As Alderman Lopez said, I am sure that if we can identify a little bit of money to certainly help out the folks down there.

Chairman O'Neil responded I am not disagreeing with that.

Alderman Gatsas stated I agree with you. I think that rather than just spending \$25,000 or \$12,000 we should take that money and get a project done. Just to sit

here and say...I can tell you that as soon as the \$12,000 study is done at Stark Park to make those corrections I will be coming to you for Derryfield because they will be impacted by whatever you do at Stark Park and I will be asking for a \$25,000 study there. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that rather than doing all of these little studies because that doesn't get anything done other than saying we have a problem. If we are going to spend \$25,000 to study the problem we might as well take the \$25,000 and invest it into the project to move it forward. I agree with you.

Alderman DeVries stated I just wanted to make you feel better and I can certainly amend this and ask for \$150,000 so that we can do the playground equipment at the same time. It was because we were being frugal and I realize that we did take care of Memorial Field improvements in this budget cycle and that is why I downgraded the original proposal, which would have included the playground equipment and have shifted back to a Master Plan only so that we can strategically look at the area.

Chairman O'Neil asked if your goal is to get the playground done why don't we just fund the playground at about \$75,000. I don't buy into we have to spend \$150,000.

Alderman DeVries answered we could do that.

Chairman O'Neil stated we had the same issues at Brown Mitchell. We were identifying \$150,000 when the playground itself only cost \$75,000 or so based on some recent installations. Now if we want to do some parking improvements I think we should work with the Highway Department to do some of that to save some money. If it is a playground that we need there then let's do the playground.

Alderman DeVries responded we can do that as well but as Ron Johnson had indicated the Master Plan we are doing there is not just to design the playground and install it. There are additional lands in the area that we want to link together for biking, recreational paths, cross-country skiing with the I-93 monies.

Chairman O'Neil asked why can't that fit into an overall City Master Plan. That is what I am saying. Planning is planning.

Alderman DeVries replied planning is planning but when you come through to do a subdivision you first conceptually look at a parcel of land in its entirety and then you break it down into individual parcels and blueprints of the framed house. We are taking this to the smaller, site specific plan that will show us the kind of detail that we can generate cost figures of exactly what it is going to take to accomplish what we want at the park. What it is going to cost to improve the bathhouse there.

We need to investigate the historical repercussions of that building because I guess it is one of two that was built in this state and there may be some abilities there. There are additional waterfront areas that we want to look at. There are...as I said the additional lands coming into conversation that we want to expand beyond the footprint of the existing park and look at the larger area to see if we can get a better passive recreational experience by linking somehow all of these lands even though we don't have connectivity of ownership between all of the parcels.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess we are not all on the same page. I think we can accomplish exactly what you want to do as part of a bigger project.

Alderman DeVries responded if you wish to amend that to \$125,000 so that we can take care of the playground at the same time I certainly would be in favor of that.

Chairman O'Neil stated the playground is \$75,000. What is the balance for?

Alderman DeVries responded I think it was \$100,000.

Mr. Johnson stated some of the playground equipment and other amenities. When we do these projects we have to make a sidewalk connection to the parking lot and there are some ADA issues and fencing.

Chairman O'Neil replied they go up pretty good every year.

Mr. Johnson responded those are the requirements. We are required to make all of the playgrounds handicapped accessible.

Chairman O'Neil asked what was the installation at Raco-Theodore this past year.

Mr. Johnson answered \$130,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked it was. That is not was this Board was told it was going to cost. Where did the balance of the money come from?

Mr. Johnson answered the total project, including the fencing...we had to redo the fencing and we had some money that was in the pool project that we used for...

Chairman O'Neil interjected that is where we get into trouble. We are led to believe it is a playground and then you are pulling in money from other projects...that is where we get in trouble here.

Mr. Johnson asked can I just finish. What we did there was we put in the handicapped parking spaces that serve the playground and also will serve the pool. While we were doing the construction it was more cost effective to get it done in that manner.

Chairman O'Neil stated in my opinion that is where we get in trouble. The Board directs you to do something, that is what you do. If you want to do something different, come back to the Board. Is playground equipment \$75,000? I don't want to hear about anything else. Is playground equipment \$75,000?

Mr. Johnson responded but when you look at the project...if you take a ride over to the park it has a sidewalk around it, it has fencing around it and we have to provide those handicapped accessible issues so the equipment itself is \$75,000 but there are additional site improvements that need to be done.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to mention that this is exactly what we did in 1992. Bob MacKenzie and the Parks Department identified everything and put a price on it and prioritized everything and probably 90% has been accomplished through this Recovery Action Plan. Would you agree with that, Ron?

Mr. Johnson answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated 90%. If we have another plan like this you would identify the priorities in the City and other information that Alderman O'Neil wants for ballparks and everything else and then you would say where the number one priority in the City is. I think Piscataquog Park is probably at the top of the list when Alderman Smith asked one day to give it a number. Probably Crystal Lake would come in number one or two. I believe, as they did in 1992, that they are capable, very capable, with \$45,000 to do what the Chairman wants and what the rest of us want and in addition go to the second stage for Crystal Lake that Ron has already outlined. I still say that we could find some funds and get this going. We accomplish both patterns at one time. We took care of Stark Park and we took care of this. I agree with you that we shouldn't piecemeal but I say that Crystal Lake has been in here before Stark Park was invented. Let's move on.

Chairman O'Neil stated if you look at the recommendations they are general. It doesn't say what the next park to do is. That is still done by either a staff recommendation or Board decision. What I am suggesting is we have done this with other capital improvement...it is laid out exactly what should be done.

Alderman Shea stated in all due fairness some of the people sitting here are responsible for certain projects that come about and I can speak for myself. When Prout Park came about it took almost four years to get that completed but we had a

Master Plan – I was given \$10,000 from CIP to buy some swings and instead of doing that we had a park architect come in and he outlined what should be done. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, if you go to Prout Park now it is very heavily used. When I got to thinking about Crystal Lake I said it makes sense because there are a lot of people living there and there is a need so why should we wait for a Master Plan which may or may not be developed over the course of the next six to nine or twelve months when we can get started on something that obviously you folks are ready to go on right Ron?

Mr. Johnson answered yes. The Recovery Action Plan that you mentioned is really a long-range plan. It is projected out over 10 years. We use it for our five-year CIP that we update each year. Prout Park was identified in there as needing work but when we got to Prout Park we still had to get down to that site specific level. That is when we had those community meetings and got the neighbors involved so we got down to that smaller level. I think we do need to do the larger plan. The last time we did it in conjunction with Planning and they just incorporated it into the overall City Master Plan. I think there is a need. Even though that long rang plan looked at the overall need when you get to a particular park you still need to study that a little further.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the Committee's wishes.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we can find the money and when we have the next meeting I will have some ideas for the Committee and depending on the situation with some of the numbers coming back from the Library and Fire Department we will be able to work this thing out.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have to be honest. I don't see our parks getting any better. The only way they are getting any better is we throw millions of dollars into them. That is where I get caught on this plan issue. We have no plan. Piscataquog Park is awful. All three fields are awful. Central football practice field is awful and there is no plan that says one of the Piscataquog fields should be rehabbed next or Central football practice field or pick any other park around the City. That is where I get going where we don't have a plan. I don't see that in here. There is no prioritizing of parks in this. It is just general information.

Alderman Lopez responded I know what you are saying but we have to realize the political aspect of the Aldermen who come on board and change things as years go by. That is the same situation we have here. We can solve this problem. It is not a major problem.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't disagree with you that that is the big issue – the political aspects of our parks but we didn't allow it to be a political issue with our



school buildings. We paid for a facilities plan and generally speaking there are going to be improvements to our school buildings. We know we do that with our sewer projects. There is a priority list and the Highway Department can tell you what sewer projects are going to be done next year based on priority because there is a plan. Am I correct, Kevin? There was a Master Plan done of the whole City and they follow that plan. The Airport follows a Master Plan. We don't have that Master Plan for our park system. That is my whole issue here.

Alderman Lopez stated I understand that and you are right and I think we can move forward and I think we can solve...we solved two parks and I think we can solve this park and move forward with Mr. MacKenzie and the Parks Department to come up with the information that you desire. I think we can do that.

**TABLED ITEM**

9. Derryfield Park Rehabilitation Phase II.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee